

### Title:

\*\*People of the Philippines vs. Joel Abat y Cometa, G.R. No. 202060\*\*

### Facts:

On November 15, 2001, Joel Abat y Cometa was charged with committing rape against his 15-year-old niece, referred to as AAA. The Information alleged that on September 22, 2001, in Barangay San Narciso, Victoria, Oriental Mindoro, Abat, motivated by lust and using force and intimidation, succeeded in having carnal knowledge of AAA without her consent.

AAA testified that Abat took her to the poblacion to buy medicine but instead forced her to jump off a bridge and then brought her to her grandfather's nipa hut where he raped her. After the assault, Abat threatened to kill her and her family if she told anyone. AAA remained silent until November 12, 2001, when she finally disclosed the incident to her parents, leading to the filing of a police report. Dr. Virginia R. Valdez later examined AAA and confirmed she had healed hymenal lacerations.

Abat denied the charge, claiming they had consensual sex in July 2001, and that AAA's claims were motivated by a property dispute between their families.

### Procedural Posture:

Abat was found guilty by the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Calapan City in 2009 and sentenced to reclusion perpetua. He appealed to the Court of Appeals, which affirmed the guilty verdict but modified the damages. Still unsatisfied, Abat brought the case to the Supreme Court, arguing primarily that the trial court erroneously relied on AAA's credibility and questioning the timeline of pregnancy.

### Issues:

1. Whether the lower courts erred in convicting Abat based on AAA's testimony.
2. Whether the timeline of AAA's pregnancy disproves Abat's guilt.
3. Whether the defenses of denial and ill motive presented by Abat are tenable.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court upheld Abat's conviction, providing the following rationales:

1. **Credibility of AAA:**

- The Court emphasized the trial court's primacy in credibility assessment, given its role in directly observing the witness's demeanor. Both RTC and the Court of Appeals found AAA's testimony straightforward and credible.

2. **Pregnancy Timeline**:

- Citing forensic medicine, the Court held that determining the exact date of pregnancy is problematic and irrelevant to the crime of rape. Thus, that pregnancy is not an element of rape, nor does its timeline exculpate Abat.

3. **Defenses of Denial and Ill Motive**:

- The Court reiterated its stance on the weakness of denial as a defense, noting it constitutes self-serving negative evidence. The claim of ill motive due to a property dispute was deemed too flimsy to discredit AAA's narrative.

**Doctrine:**

- **Credibility of Witnesses**: The determination of credibility lies best with the trial courts due to their unique position to observe witnesses' testimonies firsthand.

- **Relevance of Pregnancy in Rape Cases**: Pregnancy is not an element of rape, and its timeline does not impact the determination of guilt.

- **Defense of Denial**: A mere denial, without substantial evidence, is insufficient to overturn positive and credible testimony from the prosecution.

**Class Notes:**

1. **Elements of Rape (Article 266-A, Revised Penal Code)**:

- Carnal knowledge of a woman:

- Using force or intimidation.

- When the woman is deprived of reason or is unconscious.

- When the woman is under twelve years of age.

2. **Assessment of Witness Credibility**:

- Given the crucial role of trial courts and corroborated by appellate courts unless substantial reasons compel otherwise.

3. **Impregnation in Rape**:

- Not a requisite element demonstrated through perpetration.

4. **Denial and Defense Claims**:

- Must be substantiated; otherwise, they are typically seen as weaker than direct testimonies.

**Historical Background:**

This case occurred within the context of ongoing legal efforts to address sexual violence and the protection of women and children in the Philippines. The case reaffirms doctrines concerning the credibility of witnesses and the proper judicial responses to claims of rape, emphasizing protections under laws like the Revised Penal Code and the Anti-Rape Law of

1997 (Republic Act No. 8353). This case highlights the Philippine judiciary's rigor in handling and assessing complex testimonies and defenses in criminal cases, particularly those involving vulnerable victims.