

Title: People of the Philippines vs. XXX

Facts:

- On June 8, 2014, at around 10:30 AM, BBB observed accused-appellant XXX and her 7-year-old child, AAA, in close proximity near a poultry farm and promptly lost sight of them. Alarmed, BBB searched for AAA, who subsequently emerged from the poultry house appearing frightened.
- AAA reported to her mother that the accused-appellant had assaulted her in the poultry house by making her lie on the floor, disrobing her, and inserting his penis and subsequently his finger into her vagina, causing her pain and distress.
- The incident was reported on June 9, 2014, resulting in a warrantless arrest of the accused by PO3 Cirilo Manco after AAA's father, CCC, and the victim confirmed the assault. Dr. Grystel Gadian later confirmed hymenal laceration in AAA.
- During trial, accused-appellant relied on denial and alibi, contending that he was only a spectator to a film with adult content when AAA's mother reprimanded AAA.
- By May 11, 2017, the Regional Trial Court (RTC) found XXX guilty of Statutory Rape, largely based on the testimony of AAA and corroborated medical examinations.
- Accused-appellant XXX appealed on the grounds of a defective information and guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.
- The Court of Appeals (CA), on May 10, 2018, affirmed the RTC's statutory rape conviction while introducing a charge for Rape by Sexual Assault, citing review authority for unraised errors.

Issues:

1. Whether the information charging the accused was defective due to duplicity of offenses and if this affected the accused's conviction.
2. Whether the evidence presented established guilt beyond reasonable doubt for statutory rape.
3. Whether evidence supported a conviction for a second count of Rape by Sexual Assault despite it being unchallenged initially.

Court's Decision:

- The Supreme Court ruled that the appeal lacked merit, upholding the guilty judgments for both statutory rape and sexual assault.
- On duplicity of offenses, the Court observed that failure to challenge the information during arraignment resulted in the waiver of objections, permitting the trial for multiple offenses under a single charge.

- For statutory rape, the evidence was sufficient: AAA's age was below twelve, and her unequivocal testimony established sexual intercourse by the accused.
- Regarding Rape by Sexual Assault, the Court noted that the insertion of the finger into the child's vagina was corroborated. Despite the appellant not raising it on appeal, procedural rules allow the entire record on review, validating the CA's additional conviction.

Doctrine:

- The Court confirms the waiver doctrine: a failure to object to a multi-offense information results in the accused's waiver to challenge it post-arraignment.
- Carnal knowledge involves penile penetration, while sexual assault encompasses acts like digital penetration or using objects, as defined in Article 266-A of the Revised Penal Code.

Class Notes:

- **Statutory Rape Elements**: Victim under 12, sexual carnal knowledge.
- **Rape by Sexual Assault Elements**: Non-carnal act, such as digital penetration.
- **Rules on Duplicity**: Section 13, Rule 110, duplicate charges in one information require objection before plea.
- **Remedies**: Motion to quash, motion for a bill of particulars; failure results in estoppel.
- **Judicial Review**: Appeals open entire case history for review; potential inadvertent crime recognition.

Historical Background:

- The information structure roots itself in procedural safeguards under the 1985 and 2000 Criminal Procedure Rules, as laws adapt to broader protective frameworks like R.A. 7610 shielding minors. The case echoes the judiciary's shift toward comprehensive interpretations even amid procedural discrepancies, reinforcing robust child protection protocols.