

Title: **People of the Philippines vs. Gaudencio Vera, et al. – Tagumpay Nanadiego Appeal**

Facts:

1. **Initial Complaint and Plea**:

- July 23, 1954: Complaint for kidnapping with murder filed by Sgt. Francisco G. de Asis in Unisan, Quezon.
- December 20, 1954: Accused including Tagumpay Nanadiego entered a plea of not guilty.
- December 22, 1954: Case elevated to the Court of First Instance (CFI) of Quezon.

2. **Information Filed**:

- February 23, 1955: Provincial Fiscal filed information charging accused with kidnapping and murder.

3. **Referral to Amnesty Commissions**:

- May 11, 1955: Petition for case referral to Amnesty Commission by Provincial Fiscal.
- June 12, 1956: 8th Guerilla Amnesty Commission found the defendants didn't admit the crime, remanding case to CFI.

4. **Appeals and Affirmations**:

- July 20, 1956: Defendants' motion for reconsideration denied.
- January 31, 1963: Supreme Court affirmed that amnesty requires admission of guilt.

5. **Amnesty Grant and Motion to Quash**:

- July 7, 1959: AFP Amnesty Commission granted amnesty to defendant Nanadiego.
- January 11, 1965: Nanadiego filed a motion to quash the information on grounds of granted amnesty.
- January 23, 1965: CFI dismissed the case against Nanadiego.

6. **Prosecutor's Appeal and Continued Trial**:

- February 11, 1965: Prosecutor filed notice of appeal.
- Subsequent motions and orders for setting trial dates, most notably granting prosecution's motion to dismiss due to insufficient evidence for other accused but not Nanadiego.

Issues:

1. **Validity of Amnesty Grant**:

- Whether the AFP Amnesty Commission validly granted amnesty to Tagumpay Nanadiego.

2. **Double Jeopardy Claim**:

- Whether retrying Nanadiego would constitute double jeopardy.

3. **Dismissal by the Trial Court**:

- Whether the trial court erred in dismissing the case against Nanadiego.

Court's Decision:

1. **Validity of Amnesty Grant**:

- The AFP Amnesty Commission validly acquired jurisdiction over Nanadiego's amnesty application on July 26, 1954, earlier than the 8th Guerilla Amnesty Commission.

- Amnesty looks backward, abolishing the offense itself, so Nanadiego stands as if no crime was committed.

2. **Double Jeopardy**:

- Discussed but primary focus on the validity of the amnesty grant.

3. **Dismissal by the Trial Court**:

- Affirmed that the trial court did not err in dismissing the case, citing lack of grave abuse of discretion.

- Cites Rule 117, Sec. 2 and RPC Article 89 on extinguishment of criminal liability through amnesty.

Doctrine:

- **Amnesty and Jurisdiction**: When courts or commissions have concurrent jurisdiction, the one that first acquires it retains it to the exclusion of others.

- **Effect of Amnesty**: Amnesty obliterates the offense as though it were never committed. It is a public act to be judicially noticed by courts.

Class Notes:

- **Amnesty (Art. 89, Revised Penal Code)**: Extinguishes criminal liability and its effects.

- **Concurrent Jurisdiction**: First acquiring body retains exclusive jurisdiction.

- **Rulings on Appeals (Doctrine)**:

- Jurisdiction once acquired continues until the case concludes.

- Amnesty's retroactive effect erases the crime.

Historical Background:

- **Post-WWII Amnesty Proclamations**: Proclamation No. 8, 1946 aimed to offer amnesty to guerillas and others involved in wartime offenses against collaborators. Context rooted in reconciliation and the political landscape of post-war Philippines.