

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, V. ROBERT DELOS REYES EMETERIO, ACCUSED-APPELLANT.

Ponente: INGLES, G. T., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/28276003b5a2/>

INGLES, G. T., J.:

Before us is an appeal[1] seeking to annul and reverse the Judgment[2] of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 57, Cebu City dated April 1, 2013 in Criminal Case No. CBU-94663 for Violation of Section 5, Article II of Republic Act No. 9165 which sentenced the accused-appellant as follows:

“WHEREFORE, finding guilt beyond reasonable doubt for Violation of Section 5, Article II of RA 9165 against accused ROBERT DELOS REYES EMETERIO, he is hereby sentenced to suffer the penalty of life imprisonment and a fine of P500,000.00.

The three packs of shabu are forfeited in favor of the government.

SO ORDERED.”

Herein appellant was charged per the following information,[3] to wit:

“That on the 7[th] day of January, 2012, at around 7:15 o'clock in the evening, at Barangay Tunghaan, Minglanilla, Cebu, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, without authority of law, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously sell, deliver and distribute to a PDEA agent acting as poseur buyer three (3) heat-sealed transparent plastic pack of white crystalline substance, weighing 0.03 gram each, in consideration of the sum of six hundred (P600.00) pesos consisting of one (1) five hundred (P500.00) peso bill with serial number UX364248 as buy bust money, which when subjected for laboratory examination gave positive result for the presence of methamphetamine hydrochloride, a dangerous drug.

Contrary to law.”

Upon arraignment, accused pleaded not guilty to the crime charged. Thereafter, trial ensued.

The prosecution presented the following witnesses, namely: P/Chief INSP. RYAN ACE SALA,[4] Intelligence Officer 1 (IO1) Sisa Cortez[5] and Intelligence Officer 1 (IO1) Nicolas Gomez.[6] The version of the prosecution as amply summarized by the Solicitor General in his brief,[7] is as follows:

“Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) Regional Office 7 in Cebu City received several reports and confidential information regarding illegal drug activities of appellant.[8] On January 7, 2012, after being informed of the matter, the Regional Director of PDEA 7 designated Intelligence Officer 1 (IO1) Nicolas Gomez to lead a buy-bust operation against appellant.[9]

On even date, IO1 Gomez formed a team and held a briefing to conduct the buy-bust operation as directed.[10] The team included IO1 Sisa Cortez and a confidential informant who were designated as poseur-buyers.[11] IO1 Cortez marked the buy-bust money consisting of one P100.00 bill and one P500.00 bill with her initials “SC” at the upper right portion of the bills.[12] IO1 Gomez as team leader prepared and signed the Authority

to Operate[13] and Pre-Operation Report.[14]

The team proceeded by vehicle to Brgy. Tunghaan, Minglanilla, Cebu.[15] Before they reached the buy-bust site, IO1 Cortez and the confidential informant alighted from the vehicle and walked to the apartment of appellant. The rest of the team stayed at the highway.[16] The door of appellant's apartment was closed but the television was turned on, so the confidential informant called appellant.[17] Appellant opened the window and the door. The confidential informant introduced IO1 Cortez as his friend. IO1 Cortez said that they want to buy shabu worth P600.00 and gave appellant the marked money. Appellant went inside the apartment and handed to IO1 Cortez three packs of white crystalline substance believed to be shabu.[18]

IO1 Cortez made a missed call to IO1 Gomez, which was the pre-arranged signal,[19] while appellant had gone inside the apartment and had closed the door. The rest of the team arrived at the target area, opened the door, and entered the apartment.[20] IO1 Gomez arrested appellant while IO1 Cortez searched the body of appellant. She recovered from appellant's pocket the marked buy-bust money, additional money worth P1,270.00 and a black cellphone, which she later marked as "RN-4 01/7/12." [21]

IO1 Gomez informed appellant of his constitutional rights and contacted a representative of the media and an elected public official to witness the inventory of seized items. The witnesses were Jaime Pardillo of DYRC from the media and Barangay Captain James Getuaban as an elected public official. The team conducted an inventory of seized items at the crime scene.[22] IO1 Cortez marked the three packs of shabu as "BB-RN-1 01/7/12" up to "BB-RN-1-(3)[23] 01/7/12" with her signature.[24] She prepared the Certificate of Inventory[25] and took photographs of the proceedings and the confiscated items.[26] From the crime scene to the PDEA office, IO1 Cortez had in her custody the buy-bust money, the confiscated shabu, the black cellphone and the additional P1,270.00 recovered from appellant.[27]

At the PDEA office, IO1 Jonar Cuayzon entered the entire incident in the PDEA Blotter, which was reflected in a Certification.[28] IO1 Cortez prepared a letter request for laboratory examination.[29] The PNP Regional Crime Laboratory 7 received through PO2 Cabahug a letter request from PDEA 7 and attached were the three packs containing white crystalline substance believed to be shabu.[30]

Police Chief Inspector Ryan Ace Sala, Forensic Chemical Officer at the PNP Crime Laboratory at Cebu City, conducted a forensic examination on the three packs containing white crystalline substance for the determination of illegal drugs[31] and prepared and signed Chemistry Report No. D-026-2012.[32] Qualitative examination conducted on the specimens gave POSITIVE results to the tests for the presence of Methamphetamine Hydrochloride (shabu), a dangerous drug. PCI Sala delivered the three specimens to PO2 Joseph Bucayan, evidence custodian of the PNP Crime Laboratory.[33]"

The defense, on the other hand, presented the accused Robert Emeterio[34] as its witness together with Niña Cruda.[35] Their testimonies, as summarized by the trial court in its assailed judgment, are as follows:

"In a nutshell, accused's evidence revealed that on the date and time in question, he was together with his girlfriend Niña Cruda at a rented apartment in Minglanilla, Cebu. Then, somebody knocked and saw Bogto, a bystander of the place and known to him for eight months. He and Bogto who was alone talked. The latter wanted to buy shabu but accused told Bogto that he does not sell shabu. However, Bogto left the P600.00 on the table and left. Accused called Bogto to get the money but the latter did not hear the call. Nina Cruda got the money to be returned later on to Bogto. Minutes later, somebody knocked, so Cruda opened. PDEA agents entered and accused was told to cooperate. The officers asked Cruda of the shabu, which the latter answered there is none. During the body search on the accused, his cellphone and cash of over one thousand pesos were taken and the P600.00 was confiscated from Cruda. When brought outside the house, (the)[36] money, three packs of shabu and his cellphone were on the table. Officer Cortez took photographs of the seized evidence and the inventory as well. The barangay official and (the representative)[37] from the media arrived and photographs were taken. Accused and girlfriend Cruda were brought to the office for detention. However, on

the following day, Cruda was released for absence of evidence against her. The charge is a fabrication.”

Based on the foregoing, the Court a quo rendered its judgment, in the manner and tenor quoted above.

Hence, the instant appeal based on the following assignments of errors:

I

THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN NOT FINDING THAT ACCUSED-APPELLANT HAD NO HAND AT ALL IN THE COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE.

II

THE LOWER COURT ERRED IN NOT ACQUITTING THE ACCUSED-APPELLANT.

The instant appeal does not merit this Court’s consideration.

Appellant contends that the court a quo erred in convicting him inasmuch as the prosecution failed to establish that a verification was made with regard the truth of the allegations in the report that herein appellant was engaged in rampant selling of shabu and maintains several runners. No test buys were conducted by the prosecution and the prosecution was also unable to present the previous criminal records of appellant.

Appellant likewise faulted the police officers for not securing a search warrant despite of the previous report of his alleged engagement in the illegal trade of drugs. The alleged informant was not also presented in court to testify on the details of the alleged buy-bust operation.

Appellant also argued that from the narration of the prosecution witnesses, it was clear that the media representative as well as the barangay captain were not present during the actual inventory as they were called in only after the same was done. There was also no representative from the DOJ contrary to Section 21 of Article II of R. A. No. 9165.

We do not agree with appellant.

The Supreme Court in the case of PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES vs. FRANCISCO MANLANGIT y TRESBALLES,[38] has ruled that:

“Contrary to accused-appellant’s challenge to the validity of the buy-bust operation, the Court categorically stated in *Quinicot v. People* that a prior surveillance or test buy is not required for a valid buy-bust operation, as long as the operatives are accompanied by their informant, thus:

Settled is the rule that the absence of a prior surveillance or test buy does not affect the legality of the buy-bust operation. There is no textbook method of conducting buy-bust operations. The Court has left to the discretion of police authorities the selection of effective means to apprehend drug dealers. A prior surveillance, much less a lengthy one, is not necessary, especially where the police operatives are accompanied by their informant during the entrapment. Flexibility is a trait of good police work. We have held that when time is of the essence, the police may dispense with the need for prior surveillance. In the instant case, having been accompanied by the informant to the person who was peddling the dangerous drugs, the policemen need not have conducted any prior surveillance before they undertook the buy-bust operation.[39]

The above ruling is reiterated by the Supreme Court in the case of PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES vs. EDGARDO ADRID y FLORES,[40] to wit:

“The Court has long held that the absence of a prior surveillance is neither a necessary requirement for the validity of a drug-related entrapment or buy-bust operation nor detrimental to the People’s case. The immediate conduct of the buy-bust routine is within the discretion of the police officers, especially, as in this case, when they are accompanied by the informant in the conduct of the operation. We categorically ruled in

People v. Lacbanes:[41]

x x x In People v. Ganguso, it has been held that prior surveillance is not a prerequisite for the validity of an entrapment operation, especially when the buy-bust team members were accompanied to the scene by their informant. In the instant case, the arresting officers were led to the scene by the poseur-buyer. Granting that there was no surveillance conducted before the buy-bust operation, this Court held in People v. Tranca, that there is no rigid or textbook method of conducting buy-bust operations. Flexibility is a trait of good police work. The police officers may decide that time is of the essence and dispense with the need for prior surveillance. (citations omitted)

Of the same tenor is the holding in People v. Dela Rosa,⁴² We underscored the leeway given to the police officers in conducting buy-bust operations:

That no test buy was conducted before the arrest is of no moment for there is no rigid or textbook method of conducting buy-bust operations. For the same reason, the absence of evidence of a prior surveillance does not affect the regularity of a buy-bust operation, especially when, like in this case, the buy-bust team members were accompanied to the scene by their informant. The Court will not pretend to establish on a priori basis what detailed acts police authorities might credibly undertake and carry out in their entrapment operations. The selection of appropriate and effective means of entrapping drug traffickers is best left to the discretion of police authorities.”

In the case before us, it was duly established that the confidential informant was with IO1 Cortez when the buy-bust operation was conducted. The non-presentation of the confidential informant is not fatal to the prosecution’s case. The presentation of an informant is not a requisite in the prosecution of drug cases. The failure to present the informant does not vitiate the prosecution’s cause as his testimony is not indispensable to a successful prosecution for drug-pushing since it would be merely corroborative of, and cumulative with, that of the poseur-buyer who was presented in court and testified on the facts and circumstances of the sale and delivery of the prohibited drug.[43]

Anent appellant's contention to the effect that the media representative as well as the barangay captain were not present during the actual inventory as they were called in only after the same was done and that there was no representative from the DOJ contrary to Section 21 of Article II of R. A. No. 9165, we likewise find the same bereft of merit. Indeed it is true that Section 21, Paragraph 1 of Article II of R. A. No. 9165 with respect to custody and disposition of confiscated drugs, provides that:

“Section 21. Custody and Disposition of Confiscated, Seized, and/or Surrendered Dangerous Drugs, Plant Sources of Dangerous Drugs, Controlled Precursors and Essential Chemicals, Instruments/Paraphernalia and/or Laboratory Equipment.—The PDEA shall take charge and have custody of all dangerous drugs, plant sources of dangerous drugs, controlled precursors and essential chemicals, as well as instruments/paraphernalia and/or laboratory equipment so confiscated, seized and/or surrendered, for proper disposition in the following manner:

(1) The apprehending team having initial custody and control of the drugs shall, immediately after seizure and confiscation, physically inventory and photograph the same in the presence of the accused or the person/s from whom such items were confiscated and/or seized, or his/her representative or counsel, a representative from the media and the Department of Justice (DOJ), and any elected public official who shall be required to sign the copies of the inventory and be given a copy thereof.”

Yet, the Supreme Court in the case of PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES vs. LEONARDO RUSIANA y BROQUEL[44], has ruled that:

“In People v. Cortez,[45] this Court held that although ideally the prosecution should offer a perfect chain of custody in the handling of evidence, “substantial compliance with the legal requirements on the handling of the

seized item” is sufficient. Behind this is an acknowledgment that the chain of custody rule is difficult to comply with. Hence, exceptions must be recognized, as indeed the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of RA 9165 does. On its own, a non-compliance with Sec. 21 of RA 9165 will not invalidate an accused’s arrest or a seizure made in drug cases. What should be of importance is “the preservation of the integrity and the evidentiary value of the seized items, as the same would be utilized in the determination of the guilt or innocence of the accused.”

Likewise, In *People of the Philippines vs. Pringas*[46], the Supreme Court held: “Non-compliance by the apprehending/buy-bust team with Section 21 is not fatal as long as there is justifiable ground therefor, and as long as the integrity and the evidentiary value of the confiscated/seized items, are properly preserved by the apprehending officer/team. Its non-compliance will not render an accused’s arrest illegal or the items seized/confiscated from him inadmissible. What is of utmost importance is the preservation of the integrity and the evidentiary value of the seized items, as the same would be utilized in the determination of the guilt or innocence of the accused.”

Our perusal of the records of the instant case reveals that the prosecution was able to establish the following: (1) IO1 Cortez and the confidential informant were able to pay appellant the marked money for the purchase of shabu which appellant himself handed to IO1 Cortez; (2) when appellant went inside after receiving the money, IO1 Cortez made the pre-arranged signal and the rest of the team arrived at the scene; (3) IO1 Gomez arrested appellant while IO1 Cortez searched the body of appellant and recovered the marked buy-bust money which she later marked as “RN-4 01/7/12;” (4) the operatives then contacted a representative of the media and an elected public official to witness the inventory of the seized items; (5) the team conducted an inventory of seized items at the crime scene; (6) IO1 Cortez marked the three packs of shabu as “BB-RN-1 01/7/12” to “BB-RN-1-(3)[47] 01/7/12” with her signature, prepared the Certificate of Inventory and took photographs of the proceedings and the confiscated items; (7) it was IO1 Cortez who had custody of the seized items from the crime scene to the PDEA office; (8) IO1 Cortez prepared a letter request for laboratory examination; (9) the PNP Regional Crime Laboratory 7 received through PO2 Cabahug the letter request; (10) Police Chief Inspector Ryan Ace Sala, Forensic Chemical Officer at the PNP Crime Laboratory at Cebu City, conducted a forensic examination on the specimen which was found positive for the presence of Methamphetamine Hydrochloride (shabu).

As jurisprudence has shown, what is of utmost importance is the preservation of the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items, a requisite present in the instant case.[48]

Lastly, our perusal of the records of the case reveals that the prosecution has proven all the elements of the crime charged. To secure a conviction for illegal sale of shabu, the following essential elements must be established: (a) the identities of the buyer and the seller, the object of the sale, and the consideration; and (b) the delivery of the thing sold and the payment for the thing. What is material in prosecutions for illegal sale of shabu is the proof that the transaction or sale actually took place, coupled with the presentation in court of the corpus delicti as evidence.[49]

In the instant case, IO1 Cortez, the poseur buyer, testified that appellant sold shabu to her during the buy bust operation. The shabu sold was examined by the forensic chemist and found it positive for methamphetamine hydrochloride, a dangerous drug. The buy bust money was also recovered from appellant. The subject shabu and the buy bust money were duly presented in court and admitted as evidence.

Appellant’s defense is primarily anchored on denial and frame-up. He denies selling shabu to IO1 Cortez. He averred that the marked money recovered from him was not his but was left behind by a certain Bogto. The latter allegedly tried to buy shabu from him but he told Bogto that he was not involved in illegal drug trade but the latter nevertheless left his P600.00.

The Supreme Court, in the case of RADITO AURELIO y REYES vs. PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES,[50] has ruled that:

“We view with disfavor the defenses of denial and frame-up. Like the defense of alibi, said defenses can easily be concocted and are common and standard defenses employed in prosecutions for violations of the Dangerous Drug Act. For these defenses to prosper there must be clear and convincing evidence. In this case, petitioner failed to adduce sufficient proof in support of his defenses. There is simply no evidence to bolster his defenses other than his self-serving assertions. Moreover, we note that the petitioner did not file any complaint for frame-up or extortion against the buy bust team. Such inaction belies his claim of frame-up and that the police officers were extorting money from him. His allegations therefore are simply implausible.

In the absence of evidence of any ill-motive on the part of the police officers who apprehended the petitioner, the presumption of regularity in the performance of official duty prevails.”

WHEREFORE, the Judgment of the Regional Trial Court of Cebu City, Branch 57 in Criminal Case No. CBU-94663 dated April 1, 2013 convicting herein appellant for Violation of Section 5, Article II of Republic Act No. 9165 is hereby AFFIRMED in toto.

SO ORDERED.

Maxino, P.A., and Francisco, R.C., JJ., concur.

[1] Notice of Appeal, Records at p. 91.

[2] Records at pp. 82-87.

[3] Records at pp. 1.

[4] Transcript of Stenographic Notes dated February 28, 2012.

[5] Transcript of Stenographic Notes dated April 10, 2012.

[6] Transcript of Stenographic Notes dated June 26, 2012.

[7] Rollo at pp. 39-57.

[8] Pp. 4-5, 30-31, TSN, April 10, 2012; Exhibit “N” (Joint Affidavit of IO1 Sisa Cortez and IO1 Nicolas Gomez), pp. 3-4, Record.

[9] P. 6, TSN, June 26, 2012; Exhibit “N.”

[10] P. 5, id.

[11] P. 5, TSN, April 10, 2012.

[12] P.6, id.

[13] Exhibit “F”, p. 5, Record.

[14] Exhibit “G”, p. 6, Record.

[15] P. 11, TSN, April 10, 2012.

[16] P. 12, id.

[17] P. 13, id.

- [18] P. 14, id.
- [19] P. 15, id.
- [20] P. 16, id.
- [21] Pp. 17-18, TSN, id.
- [22] Pp. 19-20, id.
- [23] Number in parenthesis supplied.
- [24] P. 22, id.
- [25] Exhibit “J”, p. 9, Record.
- [26] Exhibits “K” to “K-3”, pp. 11-12, Record.
- [27] P. 26, TSN, April 10, 2012.
- [28] Exhibit “M”, p. 13, Record.
- [29] Exhibit “A”, p. 58, Record.
- [30] P. 5, TSN, February 28, 2012.
- [31] P. 7, id.
- [32] Exhibit “C”, p. 59, Record.
- [33] P. 7, TSN, February 28, 2012.
- [34] Transcript of Stenographic Notes dated September 18, 2012.
- [35] Transcript of Stenographic Notes dated November 20, 2012.
- [36] Word in parenthesis supplied.
- [37] Words in parenthesis supplied.
- [38] G.R. No. 189806 , January 12, 2010 .
- [39] G.R. No. 179700, June 22, 2009, 590 SCRA 458, 470. Emphasis original.
- [40] G.R. No. 201845, March 6, 2013
- [41] 336 Phil. 933, 941 (1997).
- [42] G.R. No. 185166, January 26, 2011, 640 SCRA 635, 649.
- [43] PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES vs. MICHAEL ANDRES Y TRINIDAD; G.R. No. 193184, February 7, 2011.
- [44] G.R. No. 186139 , October 5, 2009.
- [45] G.R. No. 183819, July 23, 2009.
- [46] G.R. No. 175928, August 31, 2007.
- [47] Number in parenthesis supplied.

[48] People vs. Rusialda,.G.R. No. 188330, August 25, 2010.

[49] PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES vs. CESAR BAUTISTA y SANTOS, G.R. No. 177320, February 22, 2012.

[50] G.R. No. 174980 , August 31, 2011.

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.