

### Title:

People of the Philippines vs. Maximo Manolong

### Facts:

1. **Initial Charge and Conviction**:

- **Date**: February 4, 1948
- **Accusation**: Maximo Manolong was charged in the Justice of the Peace Court of Tanjay, Oriental Negros, with less serious physical injuries for inflicting injuries on the right arm of Fortunato Sanoy.
- **Duration of Injury Healing**: Complaint alleged the injuries would take “from 20 to 30 days to heal.”
- **Plea**: Manolong pleaded guilty.
- **Conviction**: Manolong was sentenced to 2 months and 1 day of arresto mayor.
- **Sentence Commencement**: Manolong began serving the sentence two days after February 4, 1948.

2. **New Facts and Subsequent Charge**:

- **Date**: March 12, 1948
- **Development**: Sanoy’s injuries did not heal within the expected period and became more severe.
- **New Charge**: Provincial Fiscal filed an information charging Manolong with serious physical injuries.
- **Plea and Commitment**: Manolong again pleaded guilty and was bound over to the Court of First Instance.

3. **Procedural Progression**:

- **Date**: May 5, 1948
- **Information Filing**: Provincial Fiscal filed an information in the Court of First Instance alleging the injuries incapacitated Sanoy for more than 90 days and caused deformity and loss of use of his right hand.

4. **Defense Motion and Court Ruling**:

- **Motion**: Manolong moved to quash this information on the grounds of double jeopardy.
- **Lower Court Decision**: Motion to quash was granted.

5. **Appeal to Supreme Court**:

- **Appeal**: Fiscal appealed the ruling to the Supreme Court.

### ### Issues:

1. **Double Jeopardy**: Whether the new charge of serious physical injuries constituted double jeopardy, given Manolong's initial conviction for a lesser offense arising from the same act.

### ### Court's Decision:

1. **Interpretation of Double Jeopardy**:

- The Court examined the constitutional protection against double jeopardy and its implementation under the Rules of Court (Rule 113, Section 9).
- The previous cases (People vs. Tarok and People vs. Villasis) would support dismissing the appeal. However, recent precedent (Melo vs. People) diverged by allowing trials on new facts that change the nature of the offense.

2. **New Doctrine Adoption**:

- **Application of Melo Doctrine**:

- The Court adopted the doctrine from Melo vs. People, which asserts that if new facts arise after a first prosecution for which the defendant is responsible, these can create a new and distinct offense. This does not constitute double jeopardy.

- **Rationale**:

- The supervening facts (worsening of Sanoy's injuries) justified the new and graver charge.

- **Decision**:

- The Supreme Court revoked the lower court's order quashing the information.

- **Directive**:

- The case was remanded to proceed with trial under the new information, ensuring that any new sentence credits the time Manolong already served.

### ### Doctrine:

- **Supervening Fact Doctrine**:

- When a new fact arises that changes the character of the offense after the first prosecution, and the defendant is responsible for this changed circumstance, a subsequent prosecution does not constitute double jeopardy.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Key Elements**:

- **Double Jeopardy**:

- Protection is against being tried twice for the same offense, not necessarily arising from the same act.

- **Supervening Facts**:
  - A fact that occurs after the initial trial that significantly changes the nature of the original charge allows for a new, distinct charge.
- **Relevant Legal Provisions**:
  - **Constitutional Provision**: Art. III, Sec. 1, 1987 Philippine Constitution.
  - **Rule of Court**: Rule 113, Sec. 9, Philippine Rules of Court.
  - **Application**: Provides guidance in cases where the severity of the injury or fact changes after initial prosecution.

### Historical Background:

- The backdrop is the post-World War II era in the Philippines, where judicial processes were often tested under dynamic circumstances, reflecting the evolving interpretation of constitutional rights due to jurisprudential developments. The interpretation of double jeopardy was revisited multiple times to prevent miscarriages of justice in changing legal scenarios, developing into doctrines seen in cases like *Melo Vs. People* which shaped future rulings.