

—  
Title: **The World Health Organization and Dr. Leonce Verstuyft vs. Judge Benjamin H. Aquino**  
—

**### Facts:**

1. **Assignment and Entitlement**:

- December 6, 1971: Dr. Leonce Verstuyft was assigned from Taipei to Manila as Acting Assistant Director of Health Services for WHO. Under a Host Agreement (July 22, 1951) with the Philippine Government, he is entitled to diplomatic immunity, which includes personal inviolability, inviolability of properties, exemption from local jurisdiction, and exemption from taxes and customs duties.

2. **Arrival of Personal Effects**:

- January 10, 1972: Verstuyft's personal effects in 12 crates entered the Philippines as unaccompanied baggage and were allowed free entry from duties and taxes. These crates were stored in the Eternit Corporation warehouse in Mandaluyong, Rizal.

3. **Issuance of Search Warrant**:

- March 3, 1972: Upon application from officers of the Constabulary Offshore Action Center (COSAC), respondent Judge Benjamin H. Aquino issued a search warrant (No. 72-138) for alleged violation of Republic Act 4712, directing the search and seizure of dutiable items in the crates.

4. **Protest by WHO**:

- March 6, 1972: Dr. Francisco Dy, WHO Regional Director, protested to Secretary of Foreign Affairs Carlos P. Romulo, who then advised respondent judge that Verstuyft was entitled to immunity from search and seizure under the Host Agreement, and requested the suspension of the search warrant.

5. **Judge's Response and Subsequent Actions**:

- March 16, 1972: Respondent Judge held a hearing and issued an order maintaining the search warrant unless restrained by a higher court.  
- March 24, 1972: Verstuyft filed for quashal of the search warrant, attending specially to plead his diplomatic immunity.  
- May 8, 1972: The Solicitor General appeared, asserting Verstuyft's diplomatic immunity

and joined in the prayer for quashing the search warrant.

- May 9, 1972: Respondent Judge denied the quashal for the reasons already stated and declined to acknowledge diplomatic immunity.

6. **Filing the Petition**:

- Verstuyft, along with the WHO, filed a petition with the Supreme Court to quash the search warrant and prohibit further proceedings by the respondent judge.

**Issues:**

1. **Whether the executive recognition of diplomatic immunity extended to Dr. Verstuyft is binding on the judiciary**.

2. **Whether the continuation of the search and seizure proceedings despite the claim of diplomatic immunity constituted a jurisdictional overreach**.

3. **Whether the issuance and execution of the search warrant against Verstuyft's personal effects were aligned with international law and existing statutes.**

**Court's Decision:**

1. **Executive Recognition Binding on Judiciary**:

- The Supreme Court held that the Executive Branch's recognition of Verstuyft's diplomatic immunity was conclusive and binding on the judiciary. Diplomatic immunity is a political question under the separation of powers, and courts must defer to the Executive's determination in such matters.

2. **Jurisdictional Overreach**:

- The Court ruled that responding Judge Aquino acted without jurisdiction by not quashing the search warrant, thereby ignoring the diplomatic immunity granted to Verstuyft. The judiciary must not assume an antagonistic jurisdiction against executive determinations in matters of foreign relations.

3. **Issuance and Execution of Search Warrant**:

- The issuance of the search warrant and its execution against Dr. Verstuyft's effects violated the international obligation under the Host Agreement and the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. Procedural remedies for any alleged abuse of diplomatic immunity must follow the established consultations between the Host State and the concerned UN agency, not local court

proceedings.

### ### Doctrine:

1. **Diplomatic Immunity as a Conclusive Determination by Executive**: Courts should acknowledge the Executive's recognition of diplomatic immunity without question.
2. **Non-Interference with Executive Conduct of Foreign Relations**: The Judiciary must avoid actions that may embarrass or impede the Executive's conduct of foreign relations, adhering to political question doctrine.

### ### Class Notes:

#### **Key Elements/Concepts**:

- **Diplomatic Immunity**: Personal inviolability, property inviolability, exemption from local jurisdiction, and customs duties.
- **Separation of Powers**: Political questions are for the Executive, not the Judiciary.
- **International Law**: Primacy of treaties and Conventions ratified by the Philippines in domestic law, including procedures for handling alleged abuses.
- **Republic Act No. 75**: Safeguarding the immunity of diplomatic officials, imposing penalties on any unauthorized judicial actions against them.

#### **Statutes/Provisions**:

- **Host Agreement** dated July 22, 1951.
- **Republic Act 4712, Section 3601 of Tariff and Customs Code**.
- **Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations (Article VII)**.
- **Republic Act No. 75 (Diplomatic Immunity)**.

#### **Application/Interpretation**:

- **Diplomatic Immunity**: Personal effects imported as unaccompanied baggage enjoying exemptions.
- **Internal Coordination**: Proper inter-department coordination and adherence to Executive determinations in enforcing international commitments.

### ### Historical Background:

This case reflects the Philippines' adherence to international diplomatic norms during the early 1970s, a period marked by increased international cooperation and treaty obligations,

underscoring the interplay between domestic law and international agreements, especially with specialized agencies such as the WHO.