

****Title:****

Cesar P. Guy vs. The People of the Philippines

****Facts:****

- Petitioners Felix T. Ripalda, Concepcion C. Esperas, Eduardo R. Villamor, and Ervin C. Martinez were officers and employees of the City Engineer's Office of Tacloban City. Cesar P. Guy and Narcisa A. Grefiel were the Barangay Chairman and Barangay Treasurer of Barangay 36, Sabang District, Tacloban City, respectively. They, along with Edgar Amago, a private individual and owner of Amago Construction, were charged in three separate Informations with violation of Section 3(e) of Republic Act No. 3019 (Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act).
- An audit investigation was conducted by the Commission on Audit (COA) after a letter-complaint from Alfredo Alberca about three Barangay 36 projects: an elevated path walk, a basketball court, and a daycare center.
- The Sangguniang Barangay of Barangay 36 acted as the Pre-Qualification, Bids, and Awards Committee (PBAC), accepting bids from Amago Construction without issuing proper plans for the basketball court and daycare center.
- The work programs for the daycare center and elevated path walk were prepared after construction was completed.
- Guy and Grefiel reported the completed projects to the City Engineer's Office post-completion, leading to post-hoc inspections by the office employees, who approved the accomplishment of the projects despite missing material documents and the identified audit report defects.
- The audit team found material defects and contract cost overpricing for the basketball court and elevated path walk.
- The prosecution alleged that the petitioners acted with manifest partiality, evident bad faith, or gross inexcusable negligence, causing undue injury to the government and granting unwarranted benefits to Amago Construction.

****Issues:****

1. Did the Sandiganbayan have jurisdiction over the petitioners given the allegations in the Informations?
2. Were the petitioners' guilt and the existence of conspiracy proven beyond reasonable doubt?

****Court's Decision:****

1. ****Jurisdiction****:

- The Court ruled that the Informations against the petitioners sufficiently showed the intimate connection between their duties as public officers and the commission of the offense, thus affirming the Sandiganbayan's jurisdiction.
- The Court referenced the case of *Lacson v. Executive Secretary* but distinguished it from the present case, finding that the Informations adequately detailed the offenses' relationship to the petitioners' official duties.

2. **Merit of Conviction**:

- The Sandiganbayan's decision was affirmed, holding that all elements of Sec. 3(e) of R.A. No. 3019 were proven: the petitioners were public officers who acted in their official capacities; caused undue injury to the government; and showed manifest partiality, evident bad faith, or gross inexcusable negligence.
- The Court agreed that petitioners conspired to give unwarranted benefits to Amago Construction, thereby causing damage to the government.
- It ruled that the specific acts of the accused needed for conviction do not have to be described in extreme detail in the information.

Doctrine:

The doctrine reiterated in this case is that the information should contain sufficient factual allegations linking the offense to the public officer's duties, thus invoking the Sandiganbayan's jurisdiction.

Class Notes:

1. **Elements of a violation of Sec. 3(e) of R.A. No. 3019**:

- Accused is a public officer or a private person in conspiracy with a public officer.
- The public officer commits the prohibited acts during the performance of his or her official duties or in relation to his or her public position.
- The public officer causes undue injury to the government or any private party.
- The public officer acted with manifest partiality, evident bad faith, or gross inexcusable negligence.
- **Relevant Statute**: R.A. No. 3019, Sec. 3(e): "Causing any undue injury to any party, including the Government, or giving any private party any unwarranted benefits, advantage or preference in the discharge of his official, administrative or judicial functions through manifest partiality, evident bad faith or gross inexcusable negligence."

Historical Background:

This case illustrates the application of the Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act in the Philippines, aiming to combat corruption within public service. The specific legal need was

to ensure that public officers perform their duties without bias, safeguard public funds, and prevent the misuse of power. This ruling underscores the legal system's efforts to enforce accountability among public officials during a period characterized by heightened scrutiny of governmental projects and public trust in auditing bodies like the COA.