THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. MARLON BORJA Y MILEDA, JUNEI CAZAR Y CARDONA, AND EDELYN PATALINGHOG Y LEQUIGAN ACCUSED-APPELLANTS.

Ponente: GAERLAN, S.H., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): https://batas.org/library/0f77336c4aba/

GAERLAN, S.H., J.:

Before Us is an appeal[1] from a Decision[2] dated 2 December 2011 of the Regional Trial Court of Quezon City, Branch 94, in Criminal Case No. Q-10-167295, wherein the accused-appellants were pronounced guilty beyond reasonable doubt of Violation of Section 4 (a) of Republic Act No. 9208 (R.A. 9208), otherwise known as the "Anti Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003," the dispositive portion of which reads:

> "WHEREFORE, judgment is hereby rendered finding accused Marlon Borja Y Mileda, Junei Cazar Y Cardona, also known as John Cazar and Edelyn Patalinghog Y Lequigan GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 4 (a) R.A. 9208, otherwise known as the "Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003", and each of them is sentenced to suffer the penalty of LIFE IMPRISONMENT AND A FINE OF TWO (2) MILLION PESOS and to pay the costs.
>
> The period of their incarceration will be deducted in accordance with Article 29 of the Revised Penal Code of the Philippines.
>
> SO ORDERED."

The information[3] charging the accused-appellants of violation of Section 4 (a) of Republic Act No. 9208, reads:

> "That on or between the period October 5 to October 29, 2010, in Quezon City, Philippines, the above-named accused, conspiring, confederating with two (2) other persons, whose true names, identities and whereabouts have not as yet been ascertained and mutually helping one another, did then and there, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously recruit, transport, harbor, provide, introduce or match for money for the purpose of prostitution, pornography or sexual exploitation, the following trafficked persons, namely: APPLE LAMBOJON y CUZO, MA. GLORIA SILVERIO y IMBAT and ROSEMARIE SERRADOR y OSABEL, 17, 15 and 16 years of age, respectively, all minors, to their prejudice.
>
> CONTRARY TO LAW."

Upon arraignment,[4] accused-appellants pleaded not guilty to the violation charged. Pre-trial was conducted and terminated on November 22, 2010.[5] Thereafter, trial proceeded. The prosecution presented eight (8) witnesses, namely: 1) Maria Gloria Imbat y Silverio;[6] 2) Rosemarie Serrador;[7] 3) Apple Lambojon;[8] 4) Mary Cris Gadi;[9] 5) PO3 Veronica Villareal;[10] 6) Eva Serrador;[11] 7) PSI Reynold Macabitas;[12] and 8) SPO1 Robert Eblahan, whose testimony was dispensed with after the prosecution and the defense stipulated as to his would be testimony. The defense presented the three (3) accused-appellants: 1) Marlon Borja;[13] 2) Edelyn Patalinghog;[14] and 3) Junei Cazar[15] as witnesses.

THE FACTS

The Version of the Prosecution[16]

> "On 5 October 2010, at around 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon, Edelyn Patalinghog, texted Apple Lambojon, who was only sixteen (16) years old, inquiring from her if she wanted work. The two (2) of them have known each other through the child of Edelyn, Nonoy, who is a friend of Apple. Apple asked the nature of the work but Edelyn replied just to meet her at the bridge of EDSA, Munoz, Quezon City. Upon arriving at the said location, Apple met Edelyn Patalinghog, Marlon Borja, and Gilbert Palomar. Edelyn and Gilbert asked Apple if she wanted a job. Apple again inquired about the nature of the job but Edelyn did not answer. Edelyn instead told her to bring some friends along. Apple was enticed because of the offer that she will be given P5,000.00, clothing, food, shelter. She, along with Edelyn and Gilbert and Marlon, proceeded to the place of Maria Gloria Silverio.
>
> Maria Gloria Silverio, who was then fifteen (15) years old, was in their house in Bagong Barrio Caloocan City. Thereafter, Apple appeared in her place together with certain persons whom she knew to be Edelyn Patalinghog, Gilbert Palomar and Marlon Borja. She was told by Apple Lambojon if she wanted a job. Maria Gloria inquired about the job, but Apple did not answer. Edelyn, Gilbert and Marlon only told her that if she would come with them, she will have five thousand pesos (P5,000.00). The five (5) of them, Maria Gloria Silverio, Apple Lambojon, Edelyn Patalinghog, Marlon Borja, and Gilbert Palomar went to Balintawak, Cloverleaf, Quezon City where they met Rosemarie Serrador, and Mary Cris Gadi. Mary Cris Gadi and Rosemarie Serrador, were likewise offered work by Edelyn Patalinghog and Marlon Borja when they met them after being introduced by Apple Lambojon.
>
> Maria Gloria Silverio, Apple Lambojon, Mary Cris Gadi and Rosemarie Serrador agreed to pursue the work being offered by Edelyn Patalinghog and Marlon Borja despite not knowing the nature thereof. Thereafter, they proceeded to Cubao, Quezon City and boarded a Dagupan bus going to Tuguegarao, Cagayan. It was later on that they came to know that the place of their supposed work is Maddela Province of Quirino. Upon reaching Cordon, Isabela, they were introduced to a certain Junei Cazar who paid Marlon Borja their fare. Thereafter, they boarded a red van of Junei Cazar and proceeded to Maddela, Quirino. Upon arriving thereat at around 2:00 o'clock in the morning, they proceeded to the house of a certain Abet, the wife of Junei Cazar. They were given food to eat and were instructed to have some rest. On the second day after their arrival, they started working at the "Abet's Videoke Bar". At first, they worked as waitress ("serbidora"). However, on the second day of their work, they were instructed to entertain guests. The customers would put their arms around them, kissed (sic) them, touched (sic) their private parts and required (sic) them to drink beer from which they had commission in the amount of fifty pesos (P50.00) ("Itini-table po kami, kami po ay umiinom ng beer at ang customer na umaakbay samin inaakbayan po ako. Nanghihipo po sila") Sometimes, their guests would invite them out to have sex, but they did not accede to such request ("gagalawin kami", "Kakantutin po"). They stayed at the said house and worked at Abet's Videoke Bar for two (2) weeks. Thereafter, Maria Gloria Silverio and Rosemarie Serrador were transferred to Elmar Videoke Bar, also in Maddela, where they were made to perform the same task as that in Abet's Videoke Bar. They wanted to leave the place but they do not know what bus to ride and they do not have money to spare for fare.
>
> On October 18, 2010, Mary Cris Gadi told Apple that she will escape. She asked permission from Abet to go to the market to buy slippers. She was permitted to, but she will have a companion. While her companion was busy doing errands, she asked that she will just buy something in the drug store but she ran and did not return to the Videoke Bar. Mary Cris boarded a vehicle going to Santiago, Isabela. On that night, she boarded a Baliwag Transit. A couple asked her why she was alone and Mary Cris replied that she "escaped". The couple accompanied her to the bus terminal where she slept.
>
> On October 20, 2010, Mary Cris went back to their house in Balintawak, Quezon City and told her ordeals to her sister. Mary Cris likewise told her ordeal to Ena Serador, mother of Maria Gloria Serrador and told her that

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

she worked with her daughter in Madella, Quirino in a Videoke Bar.

Mary Cris and Enah Serrador went first to the Barangay of Balintawak, Quezon City and from there, she was accompanied to the DSWD, Quezon City. At the DSWD, they were told that they cannot rescue her companions. They were referred to “Bitag”, or “Tulfo”. At the office of Bitag, she was told that her case will be referred to the NBI. Mary Cris, accompanied by Enah Serrador and Oscar Serrador, went to the NBI. Mary Cris was told at the NBI that they cannot rescue them due to the location of the place.

Mary Cris then proceeded to the CIDG on October 29, 2010. At the CIDG, the statement of Mary Cris was taken by PO3 Veronica Villareal. After the statement of Mary Cris was taken, Colonel Fajardo and Senior Inspector Macabitas planned to rescue the friends of Mary Cris in Maddela, Quirino, namely, Apple, Rosemarie, and Ria (the latter being Gloria Silverio). PO3 Villareal was given the authorization to conduct rescue operations in Maddela, Quirino. She coordinated with the CIDG in Quirino Province and after surveying the area, she coordinated with the local police officers of Maddela, Quirino.

On October 30, 2010, Captain Macabitas, with PO3 Villareal with the assistance of Maddela Police Personnel, proceeded to Abet Videoke Bar and Elmar Videoke Bar simultaneously and conducted the operation. Apple Lambojon, Rosemarie Serrador, and Maria Gloria Silverio were rescued. Marlon Borja and Junei Cazar were apprehended and brought to the nearest police station in Maddela, Quirino. At around 9:30 o’clock in the evening, they proceeded to Manila. While on their way to Quezon City, PO3 Villareal convinced Apple to text Edelyn Patalinghog to meet her. Apple met Edelyn at Jollibee Sangandaan, Quezon City. PO3 Villareal alighted from their vehicle, pretended to be a bystander and immediately effected the arrest on Edelyn Patalinghog. Thereafter, Apple, Rosemarie and Maria Gloria were brought to Camp Crame, Quezon City along with Junei Cazar, and Marlon Borja.

Upon arriving at Camp Crame, Quezon City, PO3 Villareal prepared the operational procedures such as booking of the three (3) arrested persons, the medico legal or physical examination of the arrested persons and the minors and prepared the papers for inquest.

SPO1 Robert Eblahan conducted the investigation and he prepared the inquest referral.

The affidavits of Apple Lambojon, Rosemarie Serrador and Maria Gloria Silverio were prepared. Thereafter PO3 Villareal prepared her Joint Affidavit of Arrest which she and Inspector Macabitas signed.

On October 31, 2010, Junei Cazar, Marlon Borja and Edelyn Patalinghog were subjected to inquest for Violation of Republic Act No. 9208, otherwise known as the “Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003” before the City Prosecutor’s Office of Quezon City.”

Version of the Defense[17]

“Edelyn Patalinghog, along with her husband Gilbert Palomar, works at the carinderia of her mother-in-law. She knew the complainants because they were friends with her son. She saw the complainants at the bridge in Munoz waiting for their “sugar daddy.” She always tells them not to stay at that bridge. On 5 October 2010, the complainants went to her home looking for her son, because they were going to Isabela for work and they wanted to bring her son along. However, her son did not want to, and instead Gilbert offered to go with them to Isabela. He returned immediately after. The complainants communicated by text message to Edelyn, telling her that they had reached Isabela and that their employer was kind and they were fine. She was not informed about what they did for a living.

Marlon Borja, an acquaintance of Gilbert Palomar, who sees the latter whenever Marlon is staying in Munoz, is employed by Junei Cazar who raises chickens. When the private complainants arrived at Maddela on 6 October 2010, Marlon at that time was feeding Cazar’s chickens. The complainants told Marlon that they were at Maddela for a vacation. He remembers seeing them always happy and always going out. Junei Cazar, a farmer and fisherman who also raised poultry and pigs, was, on 29 October 2010, at Jones, Isabela because his

> brother had died. He arrived back at Maddela on 30 October 2010 and had a massage by Marlon. The door was forced open by the police that afternoon, who asked where Cazar and Abet was. When they could not find Abet, Marlon and Cazar were told to come with the policemen. They were unable to do anything because they were handcuffed. At the police station, they were being asked to pay Forty Thousand (P40,000.00) pesos. Elmar, who was also arrested that day, was able to give money. Thereafter, he was released. Marlon and Cazar, however, were unable to give any money, and so they were brought to Camp Crame. Along the way, Edelyn was arrested. It was during this time that Edelyn first met Marlon and Cazar.
>
> All of them deny the charges. Marlon was told by Apple that they really had no intention to bring them to jail, but Apple and the other complainants were threatened by the policemen to file charges against Marlon and Cazar or else, they themselves will be detained along with their parents."

On 2 December 2011, the court a quo rendered a decision finding the accused-appellants guilty beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 4 (a) R.A. 9208, otherwise known as the "Anti Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003," and each of them is sentenced to suffer the penalty of life imprisonment and a fine of two (2) million pesos and to pay the costs.

Unsatisfied with the decision of the court a quo, the accused-appellants instituted the instant appeal reiterating their innocence based on the following assignment of error:[18]

> THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN CONVICTING THE ACCUSED-APPELLANTS OF THE CRIME CHARGED WHEN THEIR GUILT WAS NOT PROVEN BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT.

THIS COURT'S RULING

The appeal is devoid of merit.

The trial court did not find credible the bare denials of the accused-appellants over the candid, positive and convincing testimony of private complainants Maria Gloria Silverio, Rosemarie Serrador, and Apple Lambojon, as well as, the testimony of prosecution witness Mary Cris Gadi. A perusal of the Transcript of Stenographic Notes of the proceedings convinces Us that no reversible error was committed by the trial court when this case was decided.

Section 3(a) of Republic Act No. 9208 (RA 9208), otherwise known as the Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act of 2003, defines Trafficking in Persons, as follows:

> Trafficking in Persons – refers to the recruitment, transportation, transfer or harboring, or receipt of persons with or without the victim's consent or knowledge, within or across national borders by means of threat or use of force, or other forms of coercion, abduction, fraud, deception, abuse of power or of position, taking advantage of the vulnerability of the person, or, the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person for the purpose of exploitation which includes at a minimum, the exploitation or the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery, servitude or the removal or sale of organs. x x x

Further, Section 4 thereof enumerates the prohibited acts of Trafficking in Persons, one of which is:

> (a) To recruit, transport, transfer, harbor, provide, or receive a person by any means, including those done under the pretext of domestic or overseas employment or training or apprenticeship, for the purpose of prostitution, pornography, sexual exploitation, forced labor, slavery, involuntary servitude or debt bondage.

Furthermore, the crime of Trafficking in Persons is qualified when committed by a syndicate, as provided in Section 6(c) of RA 9208:

> Section 6. Qualified Trafficking in Persons. - The following are considered as qualified trafficking:
>
> (c) When the crime is committed by a syndicate, or in large scale. Trafficking is deemed committed by a syndicate if carried out by a group of three (3) or more persons conspiring or confederating with one another. It is deemed committed in large scale if committed against three (3) or more persons, individually or as a group.

Section 10(c) thereof also provides for the penalty for qualified trafficking:

> (c) Any person found guilty of qualified trafficking under Section 6 shall suffer the penalty of life imprisonment and a fine of not less than Two million pesos (P2,000,000.00) but not more than Five million pesos (P5,000,000.00).

Noteworthy is the fact that the Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act was passed on 26 May 2003, designed to criminalize the act of trafficking in persons for prostitution, sexual exploitation, forced labor and slavery, among others.

The application of the particular legislation on this case is proper. The circumstances surrounding this case squarely fall within the offense of trafficking of persons under Section 4 (a) of R.A. 9208. The following testimonies of the witnesses attest to accused-appellants' engagement in human trafficking activities:

> Private Complainant Apple Lambojon testified that -
>
> Q: You said a while ago that Edelyn Patalinghog texted you, what was the exact word or phrase she texted you?
>
> A: I asked her "ano yong sinasabi n'ya" and she answered "basta importante ito, basta pumunta ka nalang dito" and at around 3:00 o'clock on that day, I went to Munoz, ma'am.
>
> Q: Where exactly in Munoz?
>
> A: EDSA at the bridge (tulay), ma'am.
>
> Q: Upon arriving the bridge (tulay) of Munoz, whom did you meet there?
>
> A: Edelyn Patalinghog, Gilbert Palomar and Marlon Borja, ma'am.[19]
>
> xxx
>
> Q: When you went at Munoz according to you, you saw Gilbert Palomar, Edelyn Patalinghog and Marlon Borja, what did they say to you when you saw them?
>
> A: They asked me if I want to have a job, ma'am.
>
> Q: Who specifically asked you?
>
> A: Edelyn Patalinghog and Gilbert Palomar, ma'am.
>
> Q: What about Marlon Borja, did he say anything to you?
>
> A: He did not say anything, ma'am.
>
> Q: After that when the three (3) accused or after talking to them what happened next?
>
> A: Edelyn Patalinghog told me to bring with me some friends of mine, ma'am.
>
> Q: Did you ask Edelyn Patalinghog what will be your job?
>
> A: She said nothing and all that she said is that it's near, ma'am.

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

Q: Did you accede to her offer for you to come with her to have work?

A: I was enticed because she told me that she will give me Php 5,000.00, clothing, food and shelter, ma'am.

Q: After that what happened next?

A: We went to fetch Maria Gloria Silverio, ma'am.[20]

Private complainant Maria Gloria Silverio:

Q: When these three persons allegedly told you that "basta sumama lang kayo magkakatrabaho kayo", who was with you when they told you that?

A: Apple Lambojon, Rosemarie Serrador and Mary Cris Gadi.

Q: And could you tell us when these three persons told you that you will have work once you go with them?

A: October 5, 2010, ma'am.

Q: And to whom did they tell this to you or to your barkada, am I correct?

A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: And did you accede to their offer to you for work?

A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: Despite the fact that they did not tell you what work you will do, am I correct?

A: Yes, ma'am, "dahil po gusto ko pong may maibigay na pera sa magulang ko po."[21]

xxx

Q: And you said you left at 4:00 o'clock, what kind of transportation if you can recall did you use in leaving?

A: Dagupan Bus, ma'am.

Q: And where is that Dagupan Bus bound for?

A: Tuguegarao, ma'am.

Q: And did you in fact ride on that bus with your companions?

A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: Who were with you on board on that bus? Can you please mention their names?

A: Apple Lambojon, Rosemarie Serrador, Mary Cris Gadi, Edelyn Patalinghog, Marlon Borja and Gilbert Palomar.

Q: And do you recall what happened next when you proceeded, where you proceeded, what province?

A: Madela, Isabela.

Q: What happened next?

A: We went to the house of Abet, the wife of Junei Cazar.[22]

xxx

Q: When did you start working according to you at Abet's Videoke Bar?

A: On the second day after we arrived, we started working.

Q: And what was your work inside that Abet's videoke bar?

A: At first, we acted as a "serbidora", and on the second day, that was the time when we started working and we already earned because of the lady's drink.

Q: Let me be clarified, Madam Witness. You said "kumita na po kami", do you mean to say that before you were served lady's drink, before that you were not earning any salary?

A: "Wala pa po."

Q: Why is that?

A: Because we are still going to pay for the fare that we have.

COURT:
Who told you that you will have to pay your fare?

A: Junei Cazar and his wife.

Fiscal:
You said after two days, you started earning money, why? What did you do to earn money?

A: To drink lady's drink and if you drink which is Php120.00, Php50.00 will be ours.

Q: What do you call that which was given to you?

A: "Pag-uminom po kami ng bote, pag naubos namin iyon, may Php50.00 po kami.

Q: In question and I quote in no. 11, "ano ang ginagawa ninyo at nang customer ninyo kapag tinetable kayo?, and your answer was "kami po ay umiinom ng beer at ang customer na umaakbay sa amin", question no. 11, and the last sentence was "at minsan ay inaalok kaming maitake out pero hindi po kami pumapayag, mag-aalok din minsan ng bar fine para mas malaki daw ang kita". What is that bar fine that you mentioned in your salaysay, madam witness? May I be allowed to show, your honor, to the witness question no. 11? What do you understand by bar fine?

A: "Na gagalawin kami."

Q: You said "gagalawin kayo"?

A: Yes, ma'am.

Q: Did you in fact allow yourself... what do you mean by "gagalawin"?

A: "Kakantutin po."[23]

It can be gleaned from the foregoing excerpts that the accused-appellants committed acts in violation of Section 4(a) of R.A. 9208. Trafficking in Persons under Sections 3 (a) and 4 thereof are not only limited to transportation of victims, but also include the act of recruitment of victims for trafficking.[24] In the present case, the minor victims were recruited and transported to another place in order to work as prostitutes. In fact, they were not informed beforehand of the nature of their work. Through the machinations employed by Accused-Appellants, the minor victims were enticed by the prospect of earning a considerable sum of money that may augment their respective families' income. They were persuaded and lured by the offer of free clothing, food, and shelter. It was only on their second day of work did they realize that they are being employed as prostitutes.

Notably, the testimony of Mary Cris Gadi reveals that she was forced to go with Accused-Appellants together

with the other minor victims to Maddela, Quirino, to work at Abet's Videoke Bar.

Prosecution Witness Mary Cris Gadi testified that -

Q: Can you relay to us the circumstance how you and your companions were brought to Madela, Quirino?

A: Evelyn Patalinghog and Apple went to our residence.

Q: And then?

A: They talked to me.

Q: What happened next?

A: They asked me if I want a job.

Q: What was your answer?

A: My sister did not agree at once and she asked them where will be that job and they told us, it's just near.

Q: Do you recall who was with you when Evelyn Patalinghog and Apple went with you in your house?

A: My elder sister-Rosemarie and my cousin.

Q: When Evelyn Patalinghog asked you to go with her, did you in fact go with her?

A: I was forced.

Q: How did she force you?

A: She told me to dress up at once because we are in a hurry.

Q: And from your house, where did you proceed?

A: We first went to Balintawak bridge and Marlon Borja and Gilbert Palomar were there.[25]

Mary Cris Gadi, although not named as complainant herself, is nevertheless subjected to the same sexual exploitation employed on the three minor complainants. Because of her resolve to escape and report the crime to the proper authorities, the police operatives were able to conduct a successful rescue operation. Thus, she is considered by the trial court as the most essential prosecution witness.

It is worthy to note that the prosecution presented the private complainants themselves, who are all minors, as witnesses. A child witness is any person who at the time of giving testimony is below the age of eighteen (18) years.[26] It is settled that a child, regardless of age, can be a competent witness if he can perceive and, in perceiving, can make known his perception to others and that he is capable of relating truthfully the facts for which he is examined.[27] Moreover, it is settled jurisprudence that testimonies of child-victims are given full weight and credit, especially if they are clear, straightforward, credible and truthful.

Accused-appellants' bare-faced defense of denial cannot surmount the positive and affirmative testimony offered by the prosecution. It is well-settled that positive declarations of a prosecution witness prevail over the bare denials of an accused. A defense of denial which is unsupported and unsubstantiated by clear and convincing evidence becomes negative and self-serving, deserving no weight in law and cannot be given greater evidentiary value over convincing, straightforward and probable testimony on affirmative matters. Denial is an inherently weak defense which must be supported by strong evidence of non-culpability to merit credibility.[28]

In the case of alibi, it is elementary case law that the requirements of time and place be strictly complied with by

Bar review courses, mock exams and a study planner that keeps you on pace - batas.org

the defense, meaning that the accused must not only show that he was somewhere else but that it was also physically impossible for him to have been at the scene of the crime at the time it was committed.[29] This the defense utterly failed to do. The record is bereft of the proof required to establish the accused-appellants' alibi. Junei Cazar and Marlon Borja were arrested near the place of Abet's Videoke Bar in Madela, Quirino, the place where the three (3) minor complainants were rescued. Thus, it was not physically impossible for them to be at the scene of the crime when the continuing offense of trafficking of persons is being perpetrated on the three (3) private complainants. Furthermore, with respect to Edelyn Patalinghog, the private complainants were in unison in positively identifying her as the person who recruited and lured them to work.

Hence, the prosecution has convincingly proven the guilt of the accused-appellants beyond reasonable doubt.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the appeal is hereby DENIED. The assailed 2 December 2011 Decision of the Regional Trial Court of Quezon City, Branch 94, is AFFIRMED in toto.

SO ORDERED.

Salazar-Fernando, (Acting Chairperson) and Bruselas, Jr., concur.

---

[1]Rollo, pp. 50-59.

[2] Rollo, pp. 347-365

[3] Records, p. 1.

[4] Records, p. 175.

[5] Records, pp. 184-187.

[6] TSN, 13 December 2010, pp. 3-55.

[7] TSN, 7 January 2011, pp. 3-25; 14 January, pp. 2-27.

[8] TSN, 21 January 2011, pp. 2-43.

[9] TSN, 28 January 2011, pp. 2011, pp. 2-23; 4 February 2011, pp. 2-21.

[10]TSN, 4 February 2011, pp. 22-34; 22 February 2011, pp. 2-49.

[11] TSN, 18 February 2011, pp. 2-11; 4 March 2011, pp. 2-20.

[12] TSN, 4 March 2011, pp. 20-34; 11 March 2011, pp. 2-35.

[13] TSN, 27 May 2011, pp. 3-21; 3 June 2011, pp. 2-39.

[14] TSN, 8 July 2011, pp. 2-23.

[15] TSN, 29 July 2011, pp. 2-29; 2 September 2011, pp. 2-16.

[16] Rollo, pp. 95-99.

[17] Rollo, pp. 56-57.

[18] Rollo p. 57.

[19] TSN, 21 January 2011, pp. 10-11.

[20] Ibid, pp. 11-12.

[21] TSN, 13 December 2010, p. 18.

[22] Ibid, pp. 21-22.

[23] Id., pp. 24-46.

[24] People vs. Hadja Jarma Lalli, G.R. No. 195419, October 12, 2011.

[25] TSN, 28 January 2011, pp. 5-6.

[26] Section 4, Rule on Examination of Child Witness (A.M. No. 004-07-SC)

[27] People vs. Pruna, G.R. No. 138471, 10 October 2002.

[28] People v. Tuazon, G.R. No. 175783, September 3, 2007; citing People v. Vargas, 327 Phil. 387, 397 (1996); People v. Gonzales, 417 Phil. 342, 353 (2001); and People v. Hivela, 373 Phil. 600, 605 (1999).

[29] People v. Flores, G.R. No. 98069, January 27, 1993.

Turn this case into an audio lecture - facts, issues, ruling and doctrine - at batas.org

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.