

FEDERICO CABREJAS, NARDO SORIANO, WESCESLAO MONTENEGRO, ANGELES CABREJAS, AND JOSE GUINCAO, PETITIONERS, VS. HON. LUIS P. DONGALLO, AS JUDGE OF MUNICIPAL COURT OF MALAYBALAY, BU...

G.R. No. L-33502. July 31, 1975

Ponente: FERNANDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/0d7809e83dc5/>

FERNANDO, J.:

In this certiorari and mandamus proceeding filed by petitioners who were the accused for the crime of arson in Criminal Case No. 1877 of the municipal court presided by respondent Judge Luis P. Dongallo,[1] what is assailed are two orders of respondent Judge, the first denying a motion of petitioners praying that the case of arson against them be tried on the merits instead of a preliminary investigation being merely conducted by respondent Judge, and the second, a denial of the motion for reconsideration. It is their contention that the offense falls within the jurisdiction of respondent Judge and that the prosecution is not given the option to determine in cases of concurrent jurisdiction between a municipal court and a court of first instance where the case is triable. In a resolution of this Court, the Provincial Fiscal of Bukidnon was required to comment on the petition. He manifested that the offense imputed the accused would be that of arson as defined in Article 322, paragraph 4 of the Revised Penal Code. Subsequently, an answer was filed by the Provincial Fiscal sustaining the stand of respondent Judge. The case was set for hearing but there was no appearance on the part of either the petitioners or respondents.

Before any definitive action on the petition could be taken, there was on February 19, 1975, a motion to dismiss the same. It is worded thus: "1. That the petition for [certiorari, with preliminary injunction] has been filed and given due course by this Honorable Tribunal; 2. That the cause of action in said petition is to secure a ruling from this Honorable Tribunal to compel the Honorable respondent Judge Dongallo to try the case of People v. Federico Cabrejas, et al, (Criminal Case No. 1877) on the merits considering that the case is one for arson defined and penalized under Article 322, paragraph 4 of the Revised Penal Code which carries a penalty of prision correctional in its medium and maximum periods or a duration of 2 years, 4 months and 1 day to 6 years, hence within the jurisdiction of his Court; 3. That the Municipal Court of Malaybaliay, Bukidnon presided over by respondent Hon. Judge Dongallo is a capital town Municipal Court by reason of which petitioners herein maintained that Hon. Judge Dongallo should try said arson case on the merits under its enlarged jurisdiction (R. A. 3828) which provides that a Municipal Court of the capital town has jurisdiction to try criminal cases the penalty of which does not exceed prision correctional. Hon. Judge Dongallo, however, sustained the contention of the Provincial Fiscal of Bukidnon that since the said arson case is within the concurrent jurisdiction of both his court and the CFI of Bukidnon, and since the criminal complaint in said case filed in his court alleged the phrase [within the preliminary jurisdiction], his court acquired jurisdiction only for purposes of preliminary investigation; 4. However, Hon. Judge Dongallo reversed [his] stand by stating that he will try said arson case on the merits and required the Provincial Fiscal of Bukidnon on December 20, 1972 to present its evidence but the latter refused, 90

respondent Judge Dongallo dismissed the case, ***,"[2] Then came a resolution of this Court where it was noted that the copy of respondent Judge's order of dismissal was not attached and counsel for petitioners was required to submit such order. On April 23, 1975, there was a compliance with the aforesaid resolution enclosing the aforesaid order. There is no question then as to the criminal case having been dismissed.

WHEREFORE, the petition is dismissed for being moot and academic.

Barredo, Antonio, Aquino, and Conception, Jr., JJ., concur.

[1] The Provincial Fiscal of Bukidnon, Eulalio D. Rosete. was included as part respondent.

[2] Motion to Dismiss Petition, 1-2.

ABOUT BATAS.ORG

Study smarter at BATAS.org

The Philippine bar review and law-school companion built around how your brain actually remembers.

The complete Philippine law library - free for everyone.

More than 100,000 Supreme Court decisions, Republic Acts, and executive issuances - full-text searchable, browsable by category and year, and always free. No paywall, no login. This PDF came from it.

Audio case-brief lectures.

Any decision becomes a podcast-style lecture - facts, issues, ruling, and doctrine - with read-along highlighting and a hands-free presentation mode. Study while commuting, working out, or resting your eyes.

Bar review built on the science of memory.

Complete, sequenced courses for all eight bar subjects, narrated like podcasts and reinforced with retrieval practice and spaced review - the study techniques with the strongest evidence behind them.

The full law-school curriculum.

One subscription unlocks the entire J.D. curriculum - every subject, every lesson, with your progress tracked down to the paragraph so you can pick up exactly where you left off, on any device.

Mock exams that tell you where you stand.

Timed multiple-choice exams graded instantly, with per-subject score breakdowns and focus suggestions that point you at your weakest topics first.

A study planner that keeps you on pace.

Set your schedule and BATAS tells you every day whether you are on track for bar day - and exactly which lesson to take next.

Start free at <https://batas.org>

The law library is free forever - and your first lesson is one click away.

The text of this document is an official public record and remains in the public domain. Formatting, presentation, and compilation © 2026 batas.org.

Downloaded free from the batas.org Law Library. Share it freely - the library is free for every law student, bar reviewee, and practitioner.