### Title: Pedro Calano vs. Pedro Cruz

#### ### Facts:

Pedro Calano contested the eligibility of Pedro Cruz to hold the office of municipal councilor in the municipality of Orion, Bataan, following the 1951 elections. Cruz had been proclaimed councilor-elect by the Municipal Board of Canvassers. Calano filed a petition for quo warranto under section 173 of the Revised Election Code (Republic Act No. 180), arguing Cruz's ineligibility for the office and seeking to have himself declared elected in Cruz's place. The Court of First Instance of Bataan dismissed the petition both for being out of time and for Calano's alleged lack of legal capacity to sue. Upon appeal to the Supreme Court, the original dismissal for being out of time and on grounds of capacity to sue was reversed, and the case was remanded for further proceedings. Respondent Cruz again moved for dismissal, now arguing the petition failed to state a sufficient cause of action, which led the trial court to dismiss the case a second time.

# ### Issues:

- 1. Whether the motion to dismiss filed by respondent Cruz was out of time.
- 2. Whether the petition by Calano failed to state a sufficient cause of action.
- 3. Whether appeals in election protests regarding the eligibility of a municipal councilor were permissible under the Revised Election Code.
- 4. The necessity of a registered candidate to prove entitlement to the office when challenging the eligibility of another candidate.

#### ### Court's Decision:

- 1. The Supreme Court found that the appeal involving purely questions of law was proper, sidestepping the issue of timing concerning the motion to dismiss.
- 2. On the issue of the petition failing to state a sufficient cause of action, the Court clarified that its previous observation was not a definitive rule or doctrine. It emphasized that under Section 173 of the Revised Election Code, any registered candidate has the right to contest another's eligibility without needing to prove entitlement to the office.
- 3. The Court reiterated its stance from a previous case, Marquez vs. Prodigalidad, establishing the acceptability of appeals in election protests involving municipal councilor positions when the disputes concern purely legal questions.
- 4. The Court concluded that a petitioner is not required to claim entitlement to the office for which the eligibility of the respondent is being questioned. It highlighted that the purpose of a quo warranto under section 173 is to contest eligibility, not necessarily to secure the office for the contestant.

The Supreme Court reversed the trial court's order of dismissal and remanded the case for further proceedings.

## ### Doctrine:

The Supreme Court established that under Section 173 of the Revised Election Code, a registered candidate contesting the eligibility of an elected official does not need to prove entitlement to the contested office. It also confirmed that appeals in election protests involving municipal councilors are permissible when only legal questions are involved.

## ### Class Notes:

- \*\*Key Elements\*\*: Legal capacity to sue, timing of motions, sufficiency of cause of action, eligibility contests, and appealability of election protest decisions.
- \*\*Relevant Statutes\*\*: Section 173 of the Revised Election Code (Republic Act No. 180).
- \*\*Application\*\*: This case clarifies that in challenges to an elected official's eligibility, a contestant must not necessarily prove entitlement to the office. Furthermore, it sets a precedent that appeals in such cases are permissible provided they are grounded in purely legal questions.

# ### Historical Background:

This case occurred during a period of growing jurisprudence regarding electoral protests and the criteria for eligibility to hold public office in the Philippines. The 1951 elections provided a fertile ground for legal challenges that would shape the understanding of election laws and the rights of candidates contesting election results. The Supreme Court's decision in this case contributed to the legal framework dealing with election contests and the interpretation of the Revised Election Code.