

**\*\*Title:\*\*** Petronila S. Rulloda vs. Commission on Elections (COMELEC), et al.

**\*\*Facts:\*\***

On July 15, 2002, barangay elections were held, and Romeo N. Rulloda and Remegio L. Placido were the candidates for Barangay Chairman of Sto. Tomas, San Jacinto, Pangasinan. Prior to the election, on June 22, 2002, Romeo Rulloda passed away from a heart attack. His widow, Petronila “Betty” Rulloda, wrote to the COMELEC on June 25, 2002, requesting substitute candidacy in lieu of her deceased husband. This request was supported by an appeal-petition with multiple signatures from local electorate members.

On July 14, 2002, Election Officer Ludivico L. Asuncion issued a directive stating any votes written for “BETTY” or “PETRONILA” or the surname “RULLODA” should be read but marked “NOT COUNTED.” Despite this directive, during the canvass of votes, Petronila garnered 516 votes against Remegio Placido’s 290 votes. However, the Board of Canvassers proclaimed Placido as the Chairman.

Petronila then discovered that COMELEC Resolution No. 5217, issued on July 13, 2002, denied her request for substitution pursuant to Resolution No. 4801, which disallowed the substitution of candidates for barangay elections under Section 9.

Petronila filed a petition for certiorari to annul Section 9 of Resolution No. 4801 and Resolution No. 5217, and sought to nullify Placido’s proclamation and declare her as the duly elected Barangay Chairman.

**\*\*Issues:\*\***

1. Whether the COMELEC had the authority to deny substitution of candidates in barangay elections under Resolution No. 4801.
2. Whether Petronila’s letter request to run was equivalent to a certificate of candidacy.
3. Whether the proclamation of Remegio Placido was valid despite Petronila receiving the plurality of votes.
4. Whether the restrictive interpretation of the election laws should prevail over the mandate of popular vote.

**\*\*Court’s Decision:\*\***

1. **\*\*Authority to Deny Substitution:\*\***

The Court held that the COMELEC’s Resolution No. 4801, which set guidelines for barring the substitution of candidates in barangay elections, was not founded on any statutory prohibition. COMELEC misconstrued the Omnibus Election Code, which allows substitution

primarily by political parties, but did not preclude individual substitution in non-partisan elections. Thus, the restrictive interpretation frustrated the electorate's will, which should be the guiding principle in election laws.

2. **Letter Request as Certificate of Candidacy:**

The Court found that COMELEC had treated Petronila's letter-request as a certificate of candidacy, demonstrated by their response to her request and subsequent actions. This de facto acknowledgment by the COMELEC indicates that technicalities should not override substantial compliance and the electorate's intent.

3. **Validity of Proclamation:**

The proclamation of Remegio Placido ignored the plurality of votes cast in favor of Petronila. The Court noted that the fundamental tenets of a republican government necessitate that the candidate receiving the highest number of valid votes should hold the elective office, aligning with the principle of the sovereign will.

4. **Restrictive Interpretation vs. Popular Vote:**

The Court emphasized that election laws should be liberally interpreted to promote the people's mandate rather than technical objections thwarting the clear intent of the electorate. It highlighted that procedural niceties must yield to the substance of the people's choice.

**Doctrine:**

The case reaffirmed the principle that election laws should give effect to the sovereign will of the electorate. Procedural technicalities should not hinder the determination of true electoral outcomes. Additionally, it highlighted that in non-partisan elections, the absence of political-party-driven substitution does not preclude other forms of legitimate candidate replacement to uphold democratic principles.

**Class Notes:**

- **Key Concepts:**

- Election Laws and Popular Will
- Substitution of Candidates
- Sovereign will and Electoral Mandate
- Procedural vs. Substantive Compliance
- Non-Partisan Elections

- **Relevant Statutes/Provisions:**

- **Omnibus Election Code, Section 77**: Substitution by political parties.
- **COMELEC Resolution No. 4801**: Guidelines for barangay elections.
- **Principle**: In case of doubt, political laws should favor the electorate's will.
  
- **Application**:
  - Election procedures must align with democratic principles.
  - Technical defects should not defeat substantive voter intent.
  - Substitution provisions primarily concerning political parties do not bar non-partisan candidate changes where it aligns with voters' will.

**Historical Background:**

This case occurred in the context of the Philippine local elections system, emphasizing the importance of transparent, democratic processes even at the barangay level. It underscored the higher judiciary's role as the guardian of the people's mandate against administrative overreach, ensuring that election outcomes reflect voters' choices rather than regulatory rigidity.