

### ### Title

People of the Philippines vs. Isagani Luartes y Pastor

### ### Facts

On 21 December 1994, Isagani Luartes y Pastor was charged in the City of Manila for the kidnapping a three-year-old child, Junichi Monique Macairan, on 19 December 1994, against her will and without any legal authority. The event transpired when Junichi's mother, Evelyn Macairan, noticed her daughter's disappearance while shopping at Isetann Department Store. After paging for her daughter, Junichi was brought back by an MMA traffic enforcer and police, who informed Evelyn of Luartes' arrest for the kidnapping.

MMA traffic enforcer Francisco Lacanilao testified that he saw Luartes with the crying child, attempted to flee when questioned, but was eventually apprehended with the help from a motorcycle cop. Luartes, on defense, claimed he was merely aiding the child in finding her mother and denied intentions of kidnapping, positing a misunderstood act of compassion. However, his claim was notably weakened by his actions and inconsistencies in his narrative, especially his attempt to escape with Junichi and misleading SPO2 Gabay by claiming the child was his niece.

The trial court, siding with the prosecution, sentenced Luartes to reclusion perpetua under Article 267, paragraph 4, of the Revised Penal Code. The appeal asserts that Luartes was wrongfully convicted based on insufficient evidence and misunderstandings of his intentions.

### ### Issues

1. Whether the actions of Isagani Luartes y Pastor constituted kidnapping of a minor as defined under Article 267, paragraph 4, of the Revised Penal Code.
2. Whether intent to kidnap was sufficiently demonstrated by the prosecution.
3. The credibility of witnesses and the significance of their testimonies in establishing intent and actions of the accused.

### ### Court's Decision

The Supreme Court affirmed the lower court's decision, holding Isagani Luartes y Pastor guilty beyond reasonable doubt of kidnapping. The Court meticulously analyzed Luartes' actions, intentions, and the surrounding circumstances. It concluded that Luartes' act of

fleeing with the child, misrepresenting himself as her uncle, and failing to immediately look for her mother highlighted a clear intention to deprive the child of her liberty. The testimonies from prosecution witnesses, particularly the MMA traffic enforcer and the motorcycle cop, were deemed credible and pivotal in establishing Luartes' intent and actions. Luartes' appeal was dismissed, and his sentence to reclusion perpetua was upheld.

### ### Doctrine

The Supreme Court reiterates that in kidnapping cases under Article 267 of the Revised Penal Code, the intention of the accused to deprive the victim of their liberty is crucial. The elements of kidnapping are met when there is deprivation of liberty and intent by the accused is proven beyond reasonable doubt, especially in cases involving minors.

### ### Class Notes

- Elements of Kidnapping: Actual deprivation of liberty and intent to effect the kidnapping.
- The credibility of witnesses can be pivotal in establishing the guilt or innocence of the accused, especially when the actions of the accused are subject to interpretation.
- Misrepresentation by the accused in situations involving potential crimes can be damaging to claims of innocence.
- Article 267, paragraph 4, of the Revised Penal Code specifically addresses the kidnapping of minors, imposing severe penalties to protect children from such offenses.

### ### Historical Background

The case occurred in a time when child abductions were becoming prominent concerns in Philippine society, pressing the judicial system to scrutinize such cases rigorously. This decision underscores the judiciary's resolve to protect minors from unlawful detention and kidnapping, emphasizing the crucial role of intent and action in constituting this grave offense.