

Title: **Benjamin P. Gomez vs. Enrico Palomar (G.R. No. L-23645)**

Facts:

Benjamin P. Gomez mailed a letter in San Fernando, Pampanga on September 15, 1963, which lacked the required anti-TB stamp mandated by Republic Act 1635, as amended by Republic Act 2631. Pursuant to these Acts and subsequent administrative orders by the Postmaster General, all mails within a specific period each year had to bear semi-postal stamps to raise funds for the Philippine Tuberculosis Society. Gomez's letter was returned due to non-compliance. Challenging the constitutionality of the Act and the implementing orders, Gomez filed for declaratory relief in the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, asserting violations of the constitutional principles of equal protection and uniformity of taxation. The lower court found in Gomez's favor, prompting the postal authorities to appeal to the Supreme Court.

Issues:

1. Whether or not the use of declaratory relief was proper in this case.
 2. Whether Republic Act 1635, as amended by Republic Act 2631, violates the equal protection clause.
 3. Whether the Act and its implementing orders violate the rule of uniformity and equality of taxation.
 4. Whether the Act constitutes an undue delegation of legislative power.
-

Court's Decision:

1. **On the proper use of declaratory relief:** The Supreme Court held that the suit was appropriately brought under declaratory relief as it sought to determine the future mailings' compliance with the Act and its administrative orders.
2. **On Violation of the Equal Protection Clause:** The Supreme Court found that the Act did not violate the equal protection clause. It reasoned that the imposition of the tax through the use of postal services was based on the ability to pay and for administrative

convenience. It further held that legislative classifications are given considerable deference in the field of taxation.

3. **On Violation of the Rule of Uniformity and Equality of Taxation:** The Court held that the Act did not violate this principle, noting that the excise tax nature of the requirement allowed for such impositions and that the tax's application was uniform within the classified group it targeted.

4. **On Undue Delegation of Legislative Power:** The Court rejected the claim of undue delegation, reasoning that the law provided sufficient standard and guidance for its implementation, and that the administrative orders issued by the Postmaster General were within the bounds of the authority granted by the legislature.

Doctrine:

The Court reiterated the doctrine that legislative classifications in taxation, while requiring reasonable basis, are given wide latitude. It affirmed that taxes imposed on specific privileges or classes of persons for administrative convenience or based on the ability to pay do not necessarily violate the equal protection clause. Additionally, the case emphasized that not all donations to private entities for public purposes require appropriations by law, provided these entities act as conduits for the state's public functions.

—

Class Notes:

- **Declaratory Relief:** Suitable for preemptive legal determinations where future rights and responsibilities are in question, under specific circumstances.
- **Equal Protection Clause:** Allows for legislative classifications for taxation purposes, provided there's a reasonable basis.
- **Uniformity and Equality in Taxation:** Tax laws must apply uniformly within the groups they target; variations are permissible if based on rational classification.
- **Undue Delegation of Legislative Power:** Legislative power can be delegated as long as sufficient standards and guidelines are provided for the exercise of delegated authority.
- **Public Purpose in Taxation:** Funding the activities of a private entity performing public functions can be considered a public purpose if such entity acts as the state's agent.

—

****Historical Background:****

The case reflects the period's legislative efforts to raise public funds for health concerns, specifically tuberculosis, by leveraging the postal system. The legal challenge and the Supreme Court's decision highlight the intricacies of constitutional law in taxation, administrative authority, and the balance between legislative intention and constitutional mandates.