

### Title: Recebido vs. People of the Philippines

### Facts:

On September 9, 1990, Caridad Dorol sought to redeem her mortgaged agricultural land from her cousin, Aniceto Recebido, in Sorsogon. Despite having no formal documentation of the mortgage, Dorol had previously handed Recebido a copy of a Deed of Sale executed in her favor. Recebido claimed the land was sold to him in 1979, contradicting Dorol's assertion of a mortgage arrangement. Upon verification, Dorol discovered a Deed of Sale dated August 13, 1979, allegedly bearing her forged signature, registered in Recebido's name. This led to a criminal complaint against Recebido for Falsification of Public Document, resulting in his conviction by the Regional Trial Court and subsequently by the Court of Appeals.

The case escalated to the Supreme Court, highlighting issues on the prescription of the crime charged, the Court of Appeals' alleged grave abuse of discretion, and the trial court's authority to order Recebido to vacate the land.

### Issues:

1. Whether or not the crime of Falsification of Public Document had already prescribed at the time the information was filed.
2. Whether or not the Court of Appeals committed grave abuse of discretion in affirming Recebido's conviction.
3. Whether the trial court erred in ordering Recebido to vacate the land in question.

### Court's Decision:

1. **\*\*Prescription of Crime\*\***: The Supreme Court ruled that the crime had not prescribed since the prescriptive period began from the date of discovery by the offended party, which was on September 9, 1990, and not the date the crime was committed.
2. **\*\*Conviction Affirmed\*\***: The Supreme Court found no grave abuse of discretion by the Court of Appeals in affirming Recebido's conviction. The possession of the forged document by Recebido led to a presumption of his authorship of the forgery.
3. **\*\*Order to Vacate\*\***: The land could not serve as a basis for possession by Recebido since the supposed title (forged deed of sale) was invalid. Furthermore, Recebido's argument as a mortgagee did not entitle him to possession, especially after an offer of redemption was unjustly refused by him.

### Doctrine:

- The prescriptive period for the crime of Falsification of Public Document begins from the date of discovery by the offended party, authorities, or their agents.
- Possession of a forged document, where the possessor is the beneficiary of the forgery, raises a presumption of the possessor's authorship or involvement in the forgery.

### Class Notes:

- **\*\*Prescriptive Period\*\***: Understand the concept of prescription and how it applies to criminal offenses, particularly the starting point of the prescriptive period (date of discovery).
- **\*\*Possession and Forgery\*\***: The possession of a forged document, especially by someone who stands to benefit from it, can lead to a presumption of guilt regarding the forgery.
- **\*\*Possession in Mortgage\*\***: In a mortgage contract, it is typically the mortgagor, not the mortgagee, who retains possession of the property unless explicitly agreed otherwise.

### Historical Background:

The case underscores the judicial processes involved in resolving property disputes involving allegations of forgery, the principles governing the prescriptive periods for criminal actions, and the importance of rightful possession in mortgage agreements.