

****Title:** Mary Elizabeth Ty-Delgado v. House of Representatives Electoral Tribunal and Philip Arreza Pichay****

****Facts:****

1. ****Background Conviction & Financial Penalty:**** On September 16, 2008, Philip Pichay was convicted of four counts of libel in *Tulfo v. People of the Philippines*. A final judgment against him became effective on June 1, 2009. He was ordered to pay a fine of PHP 6,000 per count and moral damages totaling PHP 1,000,000. Pichay completed these financial penalties on February 17, 2011.
2. ****Declaration of Candidacy:**** Pichay filed his certificate of candidacy (COC) for the position of Member of the House of Representatives for the First Legislative District of Surigao del Sur on October 9, 2012, for the 2013 elections.
3. ****Disqualification Petition by Ty-Delgado:**** On February 18, 2013, Mary Elizabeth Ty-Delgado petitioned the Commission on Elections (Comelec) to disqualify Pichay on grounds of his libel conviction, invoking Section 12 of the Omnibus Election Code, which bars candidates convicted of crimes involving moral turpitude within the preceding five years.
4. ****Pichay's Defense:**** In his defense filed on March 4, 2013, Pichay argued the petition was a belated attempt to disqualify him under a different section of the election code. He admitted to his libel conviction but maintained that it did not involve moral turpitude, attributing his liability to his role as president of the publishing company.
5. ****Election Proceedings:**** Despite an ongoing disqualification petition, Pichay was proclaimed the winner after receiving 76,870 votes. Ty-Delgado filed a motion to suspend his proclamation on May 14, 2013.
6. ****Quo Warranto Petition:**** Escalating the legal battle, Ty-Delgado filed an *ad cautelam* (with caution) petition for quo warranto with the HRET on May 31, 2013, reiterating Pichay's ineligibility on moral turpitude grounds.
7. ****HRET Decision:**** On March 18, 2015, the HRET ruled that, despite their jurisdiction, Pichay was eligible to hold office since his conviction did not involve direct participation in writing the libelous articles, thus not involving moral turpitude.
8. ****Supreme Court Petition:**** After the HRET declined Ty-Delgado's motion for reconsideration, she petitioned the Supreme Court.

****Issues:****

1. ****Does a conviction for libel constitute a crime involving moral turpitude, thus disqualifying Pichay under Section 12 of the Omnibus Election Code?****
2. ****Did the HRET err in ruling Pichay was eligible for office due to his libel conviction, despite the specific circumstances involved?****
3. ****Did Pichay's COC violate material representation requirements because he falsely claimed eligibility despite his conviction for a crime involving moral turpitude?****
4. ****Should the votes cast for Pichay be considered stray votes due to his void COC, declaring the second-place candidate the rightful winner?****

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

1. ****Crime Involvement of Moral Turpitude:**** The Supreme Court ruled that libel indeed involves moral turpitude, citing precedents that crimes mala in se generally involve moral turpitude. Therefore, Pichay's action of publishing defamatory material with malice includes such characteristics of depravity and contravenes justice and good morals.
2. ****Eligibility Interpretation:**** The Court held that despite Pichay's indirect role (as the publisher, not the author of the articles), his criminal liability was the same. Pichay's conviction for libel effectively constituted moral turpitude irrespective of his position or nature of participation.
3. ****Falsity in COC:**** The Court determined that Pichay made a false material representation concerning his qualification when he filed his COC, knowing his libel conviction involved moral turpitude and disqualified him from holding office within five years of serving his sentence.
4. ****Void COC and Stray Votes:**** Declaring Pichay's COC void from inception, the Court stated all votes cast for him were stray. Thus, Ty-Delgado, the candidate with the next highest valid votes, was lawfully the winner.

****Doctrine:****

1. ****Moral Turpitude Related Disqualification:**** A candidate's disqualification under Section 12 of the Omnibus Election Code, due to conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, remains even if the final adjudication does not directly involve physical acts of malfeasance (indirect roles like publishing).
2. ****False Material Representation:**** Filing a COC under false pretenses regarding legal eligibility due to an existing disqualification renders the COC void ab initio (from the

beginning), thus nullifying the candidate's votes.

****Class Notes:****

1. ****Elements Central to Disqualification:****

- Omnibus Election Code, Section 12.
- Definition and implications of crimes involving moral turpitude.
- Standards for false material representation in eligibility claims.

2. ****Case Citations:****

- **Tulfo v. People of the Philippines**, 587 Phil. 64.
- **Villaber v. Commission on Elections**, 420 Phil. 930.
- **Teves v. Comelec**, 604 Phil. 717.
- Revised Penal Code, Article 353 (Libel).

3. ****Legal Statutes Interpreted:****

- ****Omnibus Election Code, Section 12:**** Applicable disqualification grounds and remedy periods for electoral candidacy.
- ****Revised Penal Code, Article 360:**** Implications of involvement in defamatory publications.

****Historical Background:****

- ****Libel Convictions and Moral Turpitude:**** The case elucidates the Philippine judicial system's contemporary stance on crimes involving moral turpitude vis-a-vis qualifications for public office, reinforcing moral standards for candidates amid an evolving socio-political landscape.

This comprehensive analysis details the judicial journey and underscores precedents reaffirming moral integrity as crucial for public office eligibility.