### Title: \*\*Pilares Sr. vs. People of the Philippines\*\*

## ### Facts:

Reynaldo R. Pilares Sr. (petitioner) and his son Reynaldo Jr. were accused of frustrated homicide due to an incident on January 16th, 1994, in Meycauayan, Bulacan. Charged with attacking Pedro Bantique Jr., leading to serious injuries, the case was filed as Criminal Case No. 1023-M-94. Upon arraignment on August 15th, 1994, both plead not guilty.

The incident occurred around midnight when Bantigue was assisted home by Ernesto Mangunay, whose car later malfunctioned. While waiting for the engine to cool, they bought beer from the petitioner's store, leading to a confrontation due to a misunderstanding regarding the payment and drinking within the vicinity of the store. A chase ensued, ending with Bantigue being slashed on the face.

Petitioner and his son's defense was characterized by denials and an assertion that Pilares Sr. was not armed with a knife but a plastic material, while Pilares Jr. claimed to have been asleep during the incident. Despite these claims, the Regional Trial Court (RTC), on November 13th, 1996, found Pilares Sr. guilty of serious physical injuries under Article 263, paragraph 3, of the Revised Penal Code, citing inconsistencies in his testimony and the medical evidence. Pilares Jr. was acquitted.

The Court of Appeals, on March 28th, 2000, affirmed the RTC's decision but with modifications under Article 263, paragraph 4. Pilares Sr. appealed this decision.

## ### Issues:

- 1. Whether the Court of Appeals erred by not adhering to the rule that the guilt of the accused must be proven beyond reasonable doubt.
- 2. Whether the appellate court failed in considering the possible reversal of the trial court's ruling based on compelling reasons.
- 3. The necessity of a re-evaluation of the appellant's case to prevent a miscarriage of justice towards an older, ailing individual claiming innocence.

### ### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court denied the petition, affirming the decision of the Court of Appeals. It elucidated on several points:

- The prosecution had established both the identity of the assailant (Petitioner) and the infliction of serious injuries on Bantigue, consistent with the charges.
- The petitioner was carrying a plastic material with a chisel-like edge, which significantly

contributed to the injuries Bantigue sustained, suggesting intention without the aim to kill, proven through the nature and treatment of the injuries.

- The court found no concrete evidence of intent to kill on the part of Pilares Sr., implying the injuries were a consequence of serious physical assault rather than attempted homicide.
- Regarding Pilares Jr.'s involvement, the Court agreed with the lower courts' assessment, highlighting the reasonable doubt regarding his participation.
- It concluded that Pilares Sr.'s actions were unjustifiable, marking a clear crossing of bounds from self-defense or provoked altercation to unlawful assault.

#### ### Doctrine:

The ruling underscored the principle of "proof beyond reasonable doubt" in the conviction of crimes and clarified the requisites for establishing the crime of serious physical injuries under Article 263 of the Revised Penal Code.

### ### Class Notes:

- \*\*Proof beyond reasonable doubt\*\*: For conviction, the guilt must be proven to a moral certainty that leaves no room for reasonable doubt.
- \*\*Serious Physical Injuries\*\*: Defined under Article 263, indicating varying degrees based on the consequences of the assault, including incapacity for labor exceeding 30 days.
- \*\*Intent to Kill\*\*: Distinguished through the nature and severity of the attack, where lack thereof shifts the crime from attempted homicide to serious physical injuries.

# ### Historical Background:

The case prominently clarifies the delineation between attempted homicide and inflicting serious physical injuries, essential in criminal law to ensure just sentencing based on the actual intent and action. It demonstrates the court's role in interpreting actions during a conflict and the application of law based on evidence and established jurisprudence.