

### Title:

\*Frivaldo vs. Commission on Elections, et al., G.R. No. 87193\*

### Facts:

Juan G. Frivaldo was elected Governor of Sorsogon and proclaimed governor-elect on January 22, 1988. Subsequently, on October 27, 1988, the League of Municipalities, Sorsogon Chapter, represented by Salvador Estuye, filed a petition with the Commission on Elections (COMELEC) to annul Frivaldo's election, asserting he was not a Filipino citizen, having been naturalized in the USA on January 20, 1983. Frivaldo admitted to being naturalized but claimed it was a defensive measure against persecution by President Marcos' regime and sought preliminary hearing on his defenses. COMELEC rejected his motion, setting the case for a full hearing instead. Frivaldo petitioned the Supreme Court to set aside this decision, arguing other reasons including the petition's nature being quo warranto, which should be dismissed for being filed beyond the stipulated period in the Omnibus Election Code.

### Issues:

1. **Citizenship:** Whether Frivaldo was a Filipino citizen at the time of election.
2. **Proper Filing:** Whether the petition filed with COMELEC for Frivaldo's annulment was appropriately done even though filed beyond ten days of his proclamation.
3. **Jurisdiction:** Whether COMELEC correctly handled the filing in accordance with its powers relating to election contests and whether the Supreme Court should intervene directly.

### Court's Decision:

**Citizenship:** The Supreme Court ruled Frivaldo was not a Filipino citizen as he was naturalized in the United States and had not reacquired Philippine citizenship through lawful means such as legislative act, judicial proceedings, or proper repatriation. Frivaldo's act of filing a candidacy certificate or participating in elections did not suffice as repatriation.

**Proper Filing:** The Court found Frivaldo's argument regarding the timeliness of the petition to be irrelevant since qualifications for public office must be possessed throughout an officeholder's tenure, rendering continuous eligibility a requirement. The petition by the League and Estuye, filed upon receiving proof of Frivaldo's naturalization, was timely.

**Jurisdiction:** Despite acknowledging that COMELEC had the primary jurisdiction, the

Supreme Court took direct action due to the urgency and significance of the case - ensuring the enforcement of public office qualifications and preventing further delay inimical to public interest.

### ### Doctrine:

**\*\*Doctrine of Continuing Qualifications in Public Office:\*\*** A public officer must possess all the requisite qualifications throughout their tenure. Challenges to one's qualifications can arise at any point during the tenure, irrespective of initial validation post-election.

### ### Class Notes:

- \*\*Nationality Laws:\*\*** Repatriation and naturalization processes governed by Commonwealth Act No. 63 and Presidential Decree No. 725.
- \*\*Public Office Eligibility:\*\*** Necessity of continuing adherence to qualifications for holding public office.
- \*\*Procedural Timeliness:\*\*** Election-related challenge periods; however, ongoing eligibility requirements allow for late challenges if continuous possession of qualifications is necessary.
- \*\*Supreme Court Intervention:\*\*** Exceptional cases may see direct Supreme Court intervention, especially when a lower body's resolution may cause substantial public interest harm.
- \*\*Case Citations:\*\*** Hague Convention on Nationality Laws, Nottebohm Case (international law principles on nationality).

### ### Historical Background:

The case occurred post-EDSA Revolution, a period marked with transitional governance reforms aimed at restoring democracy. The ouster of Ferdinand Marcos had led many politically exiled Filipinos to seek roles in rebuilding the nation. The scrutiny of Frivaldo's citizenship illustrates the era's stringent measures to ensure loyalty and legal conformity for effective governance.

### ### Statutory References:

- **\*\*Section 253, Omnibus Election Code:\*\*** Timeframe for filing quo warranto petitions.
- **\*\*Article XI, Section 9, Constitution:\*\*** Allegiance owed by public officials/employees.
- **\*\*Section 42, Local Government Code:\*\*** Citizenship requirement for elective office.
- **\*\*Commonwealth Act No. 63, Presidential Decree No. 725:\*\*** Repatriation and naturalization laws.

The Court's decision affirming the disqualification of Frivaldo from his office due to non-compliance with citizenship criteria reflects adherence to legal norms, ensuring trust and allegiance toward the Philippine state by public officeholders.