

Title:

****ANGKLA: Ang Partido ng mga Pilipinong Marino, Inc. v. Commission on Elections****

Facts:

****1. Initial Legal Dispute:****

- ****Petitioners:**** ANGKLA: Ang Partido ng Mga Pilipinong Marino, Inc. (ANGKLA) and Serbisyo sa Bayan Party (SBP).
- ****Respondent:**** Commission on Elections (COMELEC), acting as the National Board of Canvassers.
- ****Issue:**** Constitutionality of the provision in Section 11(b) of Republic Act No. 7941 (Party-List System Act) about the allocation of seats to party-list parties proportional to their total number of votes.

****2. Procedural Background:****

- ****2019 Elections:**** COMELEC declared the winning party-list groups based on Section 11(b) RA 7941 and the established BANAT formula.
- ****Initial Supreme Court Decision:**** On September 15, 2020, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Section 11(b), denying the petitioners' challenge.
- ****Motion for Reconsideration:**** ANGKLA and SBP sought reconsideration, claiming that the allocation method violates the "one person, one vote" principle.

Issues:

****1. Constitutionality of Section 11(b) of RA 7941:****

- Whether Section 11(b) of RA 7941, making additional seat allocations proportional to total votes, violates the "one person, one vote" policy and the equal protection clause.

Court's Decision:

****1. Upholding the Constitutionality of Section 11(b) RA 7941:****

- ****Assertion:**** No constitutional violation exists. The Court reaffirms its earlier decision, holding that the BANAT formula effectively and fairly implements the law.
- ****Evaluation of Arguments:**** Addressed the petitioners' claim regarding the double counting of votes while clarifying that the system involves two separate rounds for different purposes:
 - ****Round 1:**** Assigns guaranteed seats based on a 2% vote threshold.
 - ****Round 2, Part 1:**** Allocates additional seats proportionally.
 - ****Round 2, Part 2:**** Distributes remaining seats among the next higher-ranked parties.

****2. Detailed Analysis of Petitioners' Proposal:****

- The petitioners' suggested deduction of the 2% threshold from the votes before Round 2 was rejected as it lacked textual basis in the law and diverged from legislative intent.
- ****Equality and Fairness:**** The established mechanism by Congress, including the 2% threshold and three-seat cap, seeks to balance representation in a structured manner within its discretion.

Doctrine:

****1. BANAT Doctrine:****

- The system described in the BANAT v. Commission on Elections decision, which provides operational mechanics for seat allocation, continues to be the binding legal standard.

****2. Judicial Limitation:****

- Courts should not engage in judicial legislation by redefining or expanding statutory formulas contrary to textual and legislative directives without clear constitutional violations.

Class Notes:

****Key Elements and Concepts:****

1. ****Party-List System:**** Governed by RA 7941; allocates seats based on proportional representation while ensuring minority and marginalized groups have legislative representation.
2. ****Legislative Discretion:**** Congress has significant latitude to establish parameters for electoral systems.
3. ****Judicial Restraint:**** Courts interpret but do not alter or rewrite legislative criteria unless constitutionally mandated.
4. ****Proportionality Principle:**** Ensures votes are fairly translated into representation through established thresholds and limits.

****Statutory Provision:****

- ****Section 11(b), RA 7941:**** Dictates the formula for seat allocation, including:
 - Guaranteed one seat for party-lists receiving at least 2% of votes.
 - Additional seats proportional to the total votes.
 - Caps at three seats per party-list organization.

Historical Background:

- ****Context:**** RA 7941 instituted the party-list system in response to demands for broader representation and inclusivity within the legislative framework.

- **Evolution:** The formula, including the BANAT decision, reflects ongoing adjustments to best represent a plurality of interests in Philippine legislative processes.

This detailed brief provides clarity and comprehensive legal treatment of the issues, reflecting on historical developments and statutory interpretations relevant to the party-list system in Philippine jurisprudence.