

### Title: People of the Philippines vs. Sandy Domingo y Labis

### Facts:

The case began when an Information was filed on January 26, 2004, charging Sandy Domingo with Forcible Abduction with Rape. This was for an incident occurring between January 24 and 25, 2004, in Rosario, Cavite, Philippines. Domingo, allegedly by means of force and intimidation and with a bladed weapon, abducted AAA (a pseudonym to protect the victim's identity) and subsequently raped her.

Upon arraignment, Domingo pleaded not guilty, leading to a trial where both the prosecution and defense presented their evidence. The prosecution based its case primarily on the testimony of AAA, who narrated the sequence of events leading to and during the crime. On the other hand, Domingo, supported by a witness, claimed that AAA was his girlfriend and that they had eloped.

The Regional Trial Court (RTC) found Domingo guilty and sentenced him to reclusion perpetua, along with ordering him to pay damages. Upon appeal, the Court of Appeals affirmed the RTC's decision. Domingo then appealed to the Supreme Court, challenging the credibility of AAA's testimony and the conclusions drawn by the lower courts.

### Issues:

1. Whether the testimony of AAA was credible and sufficient to support a conviction.
2. The relevance of the non-presentation of the examining physician to corroborate AAA's claims.
3. The applicability of the "sweetheart defense" as argued by Domingo.
4. Whether the legal characterization of the crime as Forcible Abduction with Rape was correct.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court affirmed the conviction but modified the characterization of the crime to simple rape. Key points include:

- The Court found AAA's testimony to be credible, noting the constancy and detail of her narrative despite cross-examination.
- The non-presentation of the examining physician was deemed not to significantly affect the credibility of AAA's testimony, as the Supreme Court has consistently held that medical

findings are not indispensable in rape convictions.

- The “sweetheart defense” was dismissed due to lack of corroboration and was deemed irrelevant to the use of force in the commission of rape.
- Importantly, the Court distinguished that while forcible abduction occurred, the criminal act was ultimately absorbed by the rape because Domingo’s primary objective was found to be the commission of rape. Therefore, Domingo was convicted of simple rape rather than the complex crime of forcible abduction with rape.

### ### Doctrine:

- The testimony of a rape victim, when credible and consistent, is sufficient to support a conviction even in the absence of medical examination.
- The defense of romantic involvement does not negate the commission of rape where force or intimidation is established.
- In cases where the primary objective is the commission of rape, forcible abduction is absorbed by rape, resulting in a conviction for simple rape.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Credibility of Witnesses**: In rape cases, the victim’s testimony can be the sole basis for conviction if it is credible, consistent, and believable.
- **Forcible Abduction Absorbed by Rape**: When the principal intent of abduction is to commit rape, the crime is simplified to rape, not a complex crime.
- **Relevance of Medical Examination**: Medical findings are not mandatory to establish the occurrence of rape.
- **Defense Strategies**: The “sweetheart defense” requires substantial evidence to be considered valid and does not excuse the use of force or intimidation to engage in sexual acts.

### ### Historical Background:

The legal evolution of the classification of rape and its dissociation from crimes of forcible abduction reflects the Philippine legal system’s nuanced understanding of crimes involving sexual assault. The People of the Philippines vs. Sandy Domingo y Labis case highlights the judiciary’s approach in scrutinizing the intent behind the crime and the paramountcy of victims’ testimonies in sexual crimes. It establishes a precedent on the importance of the perpetrator’s primary objective in determining the appropriate legal classification and subsequent conviction for crimes involving elements of both forcible abduction and rape.