

**THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF, VS. GUILLERMO CAPADOCIA, ET AL., DEFENDANTS, FLAVIO NAVA ALIAS CAPT. OGAT, ALIAS DIEGO, NICOLAS B. CENTENO, ALIAS PETER, AND WILLIAM D....**

*G.R. No. L-4907. June 29, 1963*

Ponente: CONCEPCION, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/35dfb893ba74/>

---

**CONCEPCION, J.:**

Appeal, by defendants Flavio Nava, Nicolas B. Centeno and William D. Regalado, from a decision, of the Court of First Instance of Iloilo, finding Nava and Centeno guilty of the "complex crime of rebellion with multiple murder and arson defined and penalized in Articles 134 and 135, 248 and 321, Case 3(a), in relation to Article 48, of the Revised Penal Code," and sentencing each of them to life imprisonment, with the corresponding accessory penalties, to pay a fine of fifteen thousand pesos (P15,000.00), to jointly and severally indemnify the heirs of each of eight (8) deceased persons named in said decision [1] in the sum of six thousand pesos (P6,000.00), to indemnify Manuel Antoniego[2] in the sum of three-hundred fifty pesos (P350.00), all without subsidiary imprisonment, in the event of insolvency, owing to the nature of the principal penalty, and to pay one-fourth (1/4) of the costs, and convicting Regalado of rebellion under "Articles 134 and 135" of said Code, and sentencing him to eight (8) years and one (1) day of prision mayor, with the accessory penalties prescribed by law, to pay a fine of five thousand pesos (P5,000.00), without subsidiary imprisonment in case of insolvency, due to the nature of the principal penalty, and to pay one-fourth (1/4) of the costs.

Said appellants are accused, together with one Crispin Aureal and 20 other persons,[3] who are still at large, of the crime of "rebellion with multiple murder and arson," in an amended information, dated November 22, 1950, containing twenty-four (24) specifications, which are summarized in said pleading as follows:

"That during the period from January 1, 1949, up to the present time, in the municipality of Janiuy and other municipalities of Iloilo province and in the city of Iloilo, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Court, the above-named defendants, conspiring, confederating, and working together with about 600 others, whose identities, are still unknown and with the object of overthrowing the Government, banding and arming themselves together and organizing a purported army, and affiliating with the HMB, an insurrectionary organization in Luzon, for the purpose of forcibly removing from power, His Excellency the present President of the Philippines and other high government officials or of overthrowing the present Government and to replace it with one of their own making, did then and there wilfully, unlawfully and feloniously engage in plotting and organizing rebellious movements, in circulating seditious and revolutionary pamphlets, and rise publicly and take up arm against the Government or its agencies by raiding municipal buildings, barrios, and towns and looting them, killing Government officials and employees and civilians, ambushing police and constabulary patrols, and engaging in actual killing shooting: and skirmishing with the police and Philippine Army and Constabulary forces and setting fire to dwelling houses of the inhabitants, in the manner herein set forth, to wit:" (Here follow the 24 specific counts).

When the case was called for trial of said four (4) defendants, Crispin Aureal withdrew his former plea of "not guilty" and entered, in lieu thereof, that of "guilty", whereupon he was sentenced accordingly, in a separate decision. Then herein appellant" were tried.

The evidence against appellant Regalado consists mainly of the testimony of Alfredo Aguilar, to the effect—and the lower court found—that, on October 15, 1959, at about 9:00 a.m., Aguilar delivered to Regalado, in his gun store (Filipino Gun Store) in the city of Iloilo, a letter of Huk commander "Roland", addressed to Regalado, and the sum of P210, which, together with said letter, had been brought to the law office of appellant Centeno, in the same city, that morning, at about 8 o'clock, by a woman called "Cherry", who was a special Huk courier; that, after reading said letter, Regalado showed to Aguilar fifty (50) clips and two-hundred (200) rounds of ammunition, caliber .30, for rifle, and bade him (Aguilar) to tell Cherry to wait for him (Regalado) in said office of Centeno that afternoon, at three o'clock; that Regalado went to Centeno's office at said time, bringing with him a package, one foot and one-fourth long and eleven inches in width, containing six-hundred (600) rounds of ammunition for rifle, caliber .30, which he delivered to Cherry; and that before Cherry, who left immediately, was gone, Regalado said to her: "You tell Roland that this ammunition came from me, and if he needs more ammunition, he should send money because for the present, there are yet plenty in my possession."

The prosecution introduced, also, the testimony of A. Lozada, an adjutant in the headquarters of the Philippine Constabulary in Iloilo, who declared that, in a search made on November 15, 1950, two (2) pistols, one (1) revolver, fourteen (14) magazines, sixteen (16) Garand clips and three hundred eighty-nine (389) rounds of ammunition were found in said gun store of Regalado, not entered in the records thereof, despite the fact that his previous authority—as chief informer of the PC operatives in the province of Iloilo, who, as such, had rendered valuable services to the Government—to purchase and/or retrieve loose, unlicensed and/or surrendered firearms and ammunitions had been cancelled since October 25, 1950, and that he had then been instructed to turn over to said headquarters, within two (2) days, such firearms and ammunitions as he may have acquired prior thereto, in pursuance of said authority.

Regalado denied the truth of the aforementioned testimony of Aguilar, as well as being a Communist or a Huk, and asserted that his store was closed and he did not go thereto on October 15, 1950, because it was Sunday, and he was then in the Iloilo Rifle Association since 8:15 a.m., and then in the Villa Beach Club of Iloilo, from 10:45 a.m. to late in the afternoon. Fidencio Varona corroborated Regalado's story as to his aforementioned presence in the Villa Beach Club. Regalado explained, also, that some of the firearms found in his store on November 15, 1950, were there solely for cleaning and nickel plating purposes, and that his failure to report to the Constabulary the presence in said store of the unlicensed firearms and the ammunitions therein seized by the Constabulary, on that date, was due to the fact that said objects were acquired by him only 4 days prior thereto, and that his report for November, 1950 was not due until the end of that month, when he was already under investigation by the authorities.

We find the testimony of prosecution witness Alfredo Aguilar unworthy of credence. His story on the witness stand bears strong earmarks of lack of veracity. For instance, he would have us believe that he went to the law office of appellant Centeno in the morning of October 15, 1950, because he (Aguilar) was a clerk of the latter, who bade him to deliver to Regalado the letter of Commander Roland and the sum of P210.00 brought by Cherry for the purchase of ammunition; that, after giving this instruction, Centeno left him (Aguilar) with Cherry, stating that he (Centeno) was going to the court in connection with the hearing of a case; and that he (Aguilar) was present when Regalado delivered six hundred (600) rounds of ammunition to Cherry in said law office that afternoon. It appears, however, that October 15, 1950 was Sunday, so that Aguilar could not have then reported for work, and Centeno could not have possibly told him that he (Centeno) was then going to court. For the same

reason, it is incredible that, by proceeding directly to the Filipino Gun Store, Aguilar found Regalado therein, although it was Sunday, and there had been no previous agreement to meet there, on that date. Similarly, had Regalado delivered six hundred (600) rounds of ammunition to Cherry upon payment of the sum of two hundred ten pesos (P210.00), as supposedly directed or requested in a letter of Commander Roland to Regalado, it would have been patently unnecessary for this appellant to remind Cherry to tell Roland that the ammunition had come from him (Regalado). Again, Aguilar asserted that, upon receipt of the package containing six hundred (600) rounds of ammunition, Cherry left Centeno's law office with the package "under her arms" or "under her arm pit," as if the package were so light that a woman could easily carry it. Yet, defense counsel avers, and the prosecution does not deny, that His Honor, the Trial Judge, found, in open court that a bag containing 600 rounds of rifle ammunition caliber .30 was so heavy that he could not, or found it difficult to, lift it.

The evidence against Regalado is clearly insufficient, therefore, to establish the crime charged. What is more, said evidence suggests that Regalado is neither a Communist nor a Huk. Otherwise, why should he demand a monetary consideration for the ammunition he allegedly delivered to Cherry? Why should he bid her to allegedly remind Commander Roland of the necessity of sending more money if he (Roland) wanted more ammunition? And why should this alleged message be limited only to ammunition, instead of including, also, arms? Even if the evidence for the defence were entirely disregarded, the most that could be said about Regalado—if the proof for the prosecution were given full faith and credence—would be that he did not care who bought the ammunition, provided its price was paid to him. This act is not punishable under our laws on rebellion, although it might, under certain conditions, constitute a crime if committed in relation to treason (Art. 116, Revised Penal Code).

With respect to appellant Nicolas B. Centeno, only two (2) of the twenty-four (24) specifications contained in the amended information herein, dated November 22, 1950, make any express reference to him. It is alleged in count No. XX that, during the period from September, 1949 to said date, Centeno had, together with the other defendants, circulated insurrectionary articles and pamphlets; delivered, advocated and propagated highly seditious and revolutionary ideas incompatible with the permanence of the government; furnished, provided and supplied the HMB with arms, ammunitions, and provisions; and risen publicly, as well as taken up arms, against the Government, for the purpose of replacing it with another. The allegations under count No. XXIV are to the effect that, for said purpose, Centeno and his co-defendants had, during the period from September, 1949, to September, 1950, organized the People's Liberation Army, the object of which is to fight the Government of the Philippines and its armed forces; established the People's Institute in several specified places in the province of Iloilo, to indoctrinate the students therein "in highly seditious and revolutionary ideas and communistic principles incompatible with the permanency of the present, Government"; held meetings and formed "concentrations" in specified localities, "for the purpose of giving military indoctrination and/or indoctrinating communistic principles to the members of HMB organization"; solicited, asked and compelled several persons to join said organization; and solicited funds and supplies from other persons for the maintenance, aid and support of the aforementioned organization.

More specifically, the prosecution sought to prove; that Centeno is a Huk, who, as such, is known as "Peter"; that, on the first Sunday of April, 1949—or beyond the period covered by the above-mentioned specifications—he spoke in a Huk meeting in Borak, Maasin, province of Iloilo, and urged the audience to help him and one Placido Menaje gather arms with which to fight the Government; that on the last Sunday of July, 1949, he went to Bantay, Santa Barbara, of the same province, together with two (2) men, carrying a sack, containing two (2) dismantled Thompsons, which were delivered to Paterno Patrimonio, a Huk known as Kulafu, who was assured by Centeno that he would endeavor to get more Thompsons; that, sometime in September, 1949, he attended a Huk conference in the house of Placido Menaje, in Tigbanua, municipality of Maasin, and discussed therein the functions of the People's Democratic Unity; that on October 15, 1950, the Huk courier "Cherry" brought to

Centeno, in his law office in the City of Iloilo, Roland's aforementioned letter to appellant Regalado, and some money for ammunition, whereupon Centeno bade his clerk Alfredo Aguilar to take said letter and money to Regalado, in his gun store in Iloilo, and that afternoon Regalado delivered six hundred (600) rounds of ammunition to Cherry in said office of Centeno, who, however, was not present then; that, upon instructions of Guillermo Capadocia, head of the Huks in the province of Iloilo, Rodrigo de Jesus contacted Centeno that same month and year, about the arms and ammunitions he had agreed to send to the Huks, and asked him to continue supplying the same with said materials, to which Centeno replied that he had already furnished some arms and ammunitions to the organization and promised to send more; that, several days later, Centeno delivered to Cherry a package saying that it contained a Thompson and ammunition; and that in August, October and November, 1950, Huk courier Enriqueta Sulpicio brought letters of commander Roland (Peregrino Atimonana) to Centeno.

Upon a review of the record, we find that the prosecution—whose main evidence against Centeno consisted of the testimony of Lidio Tuala, Resurreccion Moñesa, Rodrigo de Jesus, Arsenio Penetrante, Alfredo Aguilar and Enriqueta Sulpicio—has not satisfactorily established the guilt of said appellant.

To begin with, prosecution witness Alfredo Aguilar confirmed his testimony, in the preliminary investigation, to the effect that, when Cherry allegedly contacted Centeno in his law office, on October 15, 1950, she told him that trigger men would be sent to kill him, unless he helped the Huks in the acquisition of ammunitions. Such threat patently shows that Centeno was not a Communist or a Huk.

Secondly, the necessity of so intimidating him, in order to secure privately his assistance in getting ammunitions for the Huks, as late as October 15, 1950, strongly indicates that he must have been wanting, prior thereto, in tokens of cooperation with the Huk movement. In other words, said admission by Alfredo Aguilar belies the theory of the prosecution to the effect that Centeno was one of the organizers of the People's Liberation Army and of the People's Institute, and that, as early as April, 1949, he had spoken publicly in Huk meetings and urged the people to help the Huks in their fight against the government; that he personally went to Kulafu, on the last Sunday of July, 1949, with two (2) men to deliver a sack containing two (2) dismantled Thompsons; or that he performed the other acts imputed to him by the witnesses for the prosecution.

Thirdly, it has been proven—by the testimony of Salvador Hechanova, Baltazar Jamelo, Oscar Hardok and Ruben Jardenazo—that Rodrigo de Jesus, one of the principal witnesses for the prosecution, had been the VicePresident of the Democratic Peasant-Workers' Union, of which Centeno was the President; that a disagreement ensued between both, because De Jesus wanted that part of Centeno's income as a lawyer be turned over to the Union or its officers; and that De Jesus was expelled from the Union for, inter alia, he had allegedly collected palay from its members without Centeno's authority and failed to account therefor to the Union. Apart from materially affecting the credibility and weight of the testimony of De Jesus, his dismissal from the Democratic Peasant-Workers' Union is an additional indication that Centeno was not a Huk, for, otherwise, he would not have dared to expel De Jesus, who was a Huk political supervisor.

Fourthly, as a practicing lawyer and president of the aforementioned Union—aside from being the local chairman of the "Laurel for President" movement—Centeno had spoused the cause of tenants in about 300 tenancy cases, and preferred administrative charges against members of the Constabulary, some of whom were, as a consequence, transferred elsewhere, because of which he had earned the animosity of certain influential sectors of the community, as well as of some officers of the Constabulary.

Fifthly, in addition to the fact that the testimony of Alfredo Aguilar regarding the alleged deal with Cherry in the law office of Centeno on October 15, 1950, is inherently incredible, this appellant has presented an impressive array of witnesses whose testimony indicates that Centeno could not have been, either in Borak, Maasin, on the

first Sunday of April, 1949, or in Bantay, Sta. Barbara, on the last Sunday of July, 1949, or in Tigbaua, Maasin, in September, 1949; or performed the ether acts testified to by the witnesses for the prosecution. In this connection, 24 witnesses testified for appellant Centeno,[4] aside from the 13 citizens of high standing in the community [5] who vouched for his good moral character.

As regards appellant Flavio Nava, the lower court found:

"\* \* \* (1) that he was at the time of the commission of the crime charged a member of the HMB, as convincingly testified to by Rodrigo de Jesus, was even present when Flavio Nava affixed his thumbmark in blood on a piece of paper in the barrio of Kipot, Janiuay, Iloilo, on January 1, 1950, when he, Flavio Nava, was formally inducted as a member of the HMB; (2) that on December 27, 1949, he, in company of Guillermo Capadocia, Norma Reyes, Pio Gonzales, Paterno Patrimonio and Rodrigo de Jesus, all Huk officials, held a meeting in barrio Dagame, Maasin, Iloilo, at which meeting the people were incited to join the HMB in its fight against the Government; (3) that he attended and underwent indoctrination in the People Military Academy' of the HMB in said barrio of Kipot for 18 days beginning the last week of January, 1950, as De Jesus categorically affirmed in his testimony; (4) that he delivered a speech in the HMB meeting in barrio Cabacanan, Alimodian, on December 10, 1949, as well as in the HMB meeting in Barrio Kipot, Janiuay, on December 29, 1949, and in the meeting of the Huks in barrio Tigbauan, Maasin, in August, 1950, urging the people to feed and join the HMB in the latter's armed struggle against the 'crooked' government, whose officials were 'all thieves,' so that the same might be replaced with a government of their own, after victory shall have been achieved by the Huks, as testified to in a straightforward manner by Jose Bendol, Bartolome Bellena and Rodrigo de Jesus, respectively; (5) that on September 13, 1950, he was in the company of Placido Menaje, alias, Santiago Apostol, a Huk official, and eight (8) armed men in the house of said Placido Menaje in the barrio of Tigbauan, Maasin, on which occasion he, Flavio Nava, alias Capt. Ogat, was armed with a .45 caliber pistol, as candidly testified to by Pascual Catalufia; (6) that one day in the same month of September, 1950, Flavio Nava, alias Diego, Placido Menaje and Custodio Solivas, all members of the 'Peoples Democratic Unity,' an affiliate of the HMB, sent Ramon Reiteracion and one Romulo to the city of Iloilo to get firearms and ammunition, as testified to with sincerity by Ramon Reiteracion; and (7) that due probably to his meritorious services to the HMB organization, he was once made over all Commander of Squadrons Malvar Evangelista and Abad Santos in Iloilo, as stated by Resurreccion Moñesa, and finally, as Commander of Field Command No. 2 (FC-2) of Reco 6 in the Visayan Islands, as Rodrigo de Jesus, former Huk political director, affirmed."

It has been satisfactorily proven, however, that:

1. On December 31, 1949, Flavio Nava went to the house of his father Jose N. Nava, in the city of Iloilo, in connection with the New Year celebration, and the next day, Dr. Jose M. Roldan treated him (Flavio Nava) of a severe attack of asthma in his (Flavio Nava's) house in the same city, where he (Nava) was, accordingly, confined for three (3) days. This was established, not only by the testimony of appellant Nava and that of Dr. Roldan, but, also, by the latter's records as a physician. Dr. Roldan further stated that he had been treating said appellant of chronic asthma since 1945, and that, because of the aforementioned disease, Flavio Nava could not be exposed to cold, dampness or fatigue without danger of an attack of asthma. Hence, he could not have been inducted as a Huk in Kipot, Janiuay, on January 1, 1950.

2. On January 4, 1950, appellant Nava took part in a meeting of the Federacion Obrera de Filipinas—otherwise known as FOF—of which he was National General Inspector, in the City of Iloilo. In that meeting he and other officers of the federation unanimously approved and signed a resolution expelling therefrom Huk leader Guillermo Capadocia, owing to a letter he had written to said federation expressing views which the latter believed to "run counter to the mandates of the Republic of the Philippines." It is inconceivable that Flavio Nava would have performed said acts if, as the prosecution claims, he was a Huk and had been inducted as such only

three days before, considering that Capadocia headed the Huk movement in the province of Iloilo. Nava's conduct in connection with the expulsion of Capadocia on January 4, 1950, likewise, indicates that said appellant could not have performed on December 10 and 27, 1949, the acts imputed to him by the witnesses for the prosecution.

3. On December 10, 1949, appellant's father Jose Nava wired his family in Iloilo that his (Jose's) son Benjamin had died in Manila. The body of the deceased was brought by Jose N. Nava to the city of Iloilo on December 12, and was buried on December 18. As a consequence, Flavio Nava was in said city during all this time, and could not have engaged then in Huk activities, either in Janiuay, or in Maasin, or in Alimodian, Iloilo.

Furthermore, appellant's testimony denying that he had undergone indoctrination in the "People's Military Academy" in the barrio of Kipot, Janiuay, for a period of 18 days, from the last week of January, 1950, has been sufficiently corroborated by testimonial and documentary evidence establishing his presence in the city of Iloilo on January 18 and 20, 1950; in La Carlota, Negros Occidental, from February 12 to February 21, 1950, in connection with a labor strike in that locality, in Manila, from February 22 to February 25, 1950, and, immediately thereafter, in Cagayan de Misamis, followed, on March 7, 1950, by a trip back to Manila, where he stayed up to March 13, 1950; and then his return to the city of Iloilo, where he attended a meeting of the FOF, held on March 16, 1950.

It is true, that there is no direct evidence corroborating his testimony on his actual presence in said city from January 20 to February 11, 1950. But, then, it is impossible for anybody in this world to introduce corroborative evidence of his actual situs every day of his life. In fact, we would, perhaps, be justified in doubting the veracity of Nava's testimony, had he introduced such corroborative evidence as to his presence in the city of Iloilo on each and every one of the dates specifically referred to by the witnesses for the prosecution. The important thing is that said testimony of appellant Nava has been so corroborated on many points as to indicate its general adherence to objective truth.

Thus, his testimony denying that he was in the house of Placido Menaje in Tigbauan, Maasin on September 13, 1950, and that, on another day, during the same month, he and some members of the "People's Democratic Unity" had sent Ramon Reiteracion and one Romulo to the city of Iloilo to get firearms and ammunition, supposedly in connection with the Huk movement, was similarly corroborated by the established fact: (a) that Dr. Mabunay treated him in said city on September 3, 9, 20 and 29, 1950; (b) that an annex to appellant's house in that city was constructed from late in August to late September, 1950, during which time he was in the city supervising said construction work and was seen therein by carpenters Jose Almeida and Alfredo Quibao, and mason Serafin Sarad, who took part in said work, and by Jose Salvador, driver of the truck who delivered sand and gravel needed therefor; (c) that on September 8, 15 and 25, 1950, he paid in Iloilo city his accounts for said materials; (d) that he was in said city on August 15 and September 16, 1950, when his electric meter was read by an agent (Jesus Borrromeo) of the enterprise operating the electric service; and (e) that he was in the same city on September 2, 14 and 22, 1950, when one Olizen made certain payments to him.

We do not overlook the general rule that positive testimony as to the presence of the accused at the scene of the offense is stronger than negative testimony to the contrary. However, the evidence for the prosecution in this case came from sources that cannot be characterized as fully unbiased and disinterested. Most of the principal witnesses for the prosecution [6] against Flavio Nava were political detainees, who could not help but fool their fate in the hands of the government depended upon the assistance they may give thereto in the prosecution of said appellant. Moreover, there is, at best, a reasonable possibility that said witnesses for the prosecution may have been misled into concluding that Flavio Nava must have been with the dissidents in the places mentioned in their testimony, because a Huk known by the name of Diego Silang had allegedly been present in those places, and the prosecution contends that Diego Silang and appellant Nava are one and the same person. The defense,

however, introduced evidence[7] which can not be lightly brushed aside or disregarded, to the effect that Diego Silang is, not Flavio Nava, but another person.

Upon the other hand, the testimony of the witnesses for the defense b, also, positive as to appellant's presence in some other place than that claimed by the prosecution, and a good number of said witnesses had no particular interest in this case. Besides, their testimony was substantially corroborated by documentary evidence, consisting, inter alia of receipts, bookkeeping entries, records of shipping companies and photographs, in some of which public officers, including an officer of the Constabulary who testified for the prosecution, appear. Then too, the number of witnesses—though not per se controlling or decisive—is a factor that adds weight to Nava's alibi. Indeed 47 witnesses testified in corroboration of his testimony, [8] and "no reason whatsoever was given" by the lower court "for disbelieving" their testimony (People vs. Palmones, 61 Phil. 680, 688-G89). Moreover, as in the case of People vs. Gonzales (50 Phil. 9, 13-14), "it seems evident that the principal witnesses for the prosecution did not tell the unvarnished truth," in the same manner as "it is quite possible that" the witnesses for the defense "in the main told the truth."

In conclusion, we find that the evidence on record does not adequately establish the guilt of appellants Flavio Nava, Nicolas C. Centeno and William D. Regalado, in view of which the decision appealed from should be, as it is hereby, reversed and the case dismissed, as regards said appellants, with costs de officio. It is so ordered.

Bautista Angelo, Labrador, Reyes, J.B.L., Paredes, Dizon, Regala and Makalintal, JJ., concur.

---

[1] Anastacio Lopez, Amador Tanque, Jose Tabat (policeman of Tubuñgan, Iloilo, who were killed by Huks when the latter attacked the town hall of said municipality on April 19, 1950), Lilia Cababaan (who was killed by stray bullets in an encounter between Huks and peace officers, in the town of Leon, Iloilo, on October 30, 1950), Sofia Andeo, Teresita Antoniego (both of whom died when a band of armed men, led by Huk commander Kulafu, attacked the house of special policeman Manuel Antoniego, in Alimodian. Iloilo, on December 1, 1949), Maximo Patriarca (who died when a number of armed men attacked the house of Severina Sostiaga in Cayan-Oeste, Lambunao, Iloilo, on April 1, 1950), and Pablo Leal (a policeman of Lambunao, Iloilo, killed by Huks on September 1, 1950), although there is neither specific allegation nor proof of any kind regarding appellant's participation in any of said events, except that of allegedly being Huks.

[2] Wounded by Huks, in Alimodian, Iloilo on December 1, 1949.

[3] Guillermo Capadocia, Paterno Patrimonio, Simplicio Casas, Pablito Gepana, Jesus Nava, Jr., Sixto Bocangallo, Herminia Depamaylo, Leon Subaldo, Espiridion Roche, Jose Peregrino, Porfirio Discaya, Nicanor Dimson, Pio Ganzales, Teodoro Tejada, Peregrino Atimonana, Placido Menaje, Julio Lalando-on, Jesus Jimenez, Custodio Solivas and Jesus Roche.

[4] Gabriel Azucena, Matias Longno, Albino Longno, Teodorico Madalogdog, Jose Navarra, Juan Centeno, Ignidio Alede, Feliciano Sumagpao, Honorio Siton, Dionisio de Luna, Vicente Gobuyan, Nazario Pradilla, Leonor Moises, Felcito Retiro, Cora O'Dell, Rosario Centeno, Salvador Hechanova, Baltazar Jamelo, Oscar Hardok, Ruben Jardenazo, Antonio Peñalver, Demetrio Salarda, Amado Benona, and Salvador Borromeo de la Rama.

[5] Provincial Governor of Iloilo, Mariano Pelaflorida, Iloilo Public Defender Alejandro Lim, Iloilo Provincial Board Member and Centeno's political opponent, Severino Ferraris, former PC Lt. Col. Luis T. Dator, former Iloilo Mayor Vicente Ybernias, Iloilo Vice Mayor Dominador Jover, Alfredo Gonzales, President of the Lopez Jaena Memorial College, Jose Bardoquillo, Director of the Panay College, Philippine Army Captain Mateo Luto,

former Provincial Fiscal of Antique, Zamboanga and Iloilo and former representative of Antique, Atty. Jose Evangelista, Atty. Ramon Yotoko of the Philippine National Bank, Iloilo Branch, Irineo Julayko, Secretary of Iloilo Chamber of Commerce, and Dolores Vazquez. widow of Dr. Mariano Arroyo, former provincial governor of Iloilo.

[6] R. Moñesa, R. de Jesus, R. Reiteracion B. Billena and P. Cataluña.

[7] Consisting of the testimony of 11 witnesses, namely: Carlos Camba, Soledad Garrido, Adriano Consumo, Cenito Consumo, Ramon Mallo, Francisco Maldecir, Evaristo Baylen, Elpidio Posadas (a policeman), Diosdado Muela, Andres Muela and Generoso Gregorio.

[8] Teodorico Madalogdod, Manuel Dueñas, Eugenio Solution, Espiridion Saludares, Antonio Rubin, Teodoro Aguisanga, Jesus Borromea, Ricardo Verga, Luis Z. Gutierrez, Dr. Jose Roldan, Vicente R. Iblernas, Jose Mabaquiao, Francisco M. Omaña, Eulogio Garganera, Jonc Salvador, Jose Almeida, Alfredo Quibao, Serafin Sarad Carlos Camba, Soledad Garrido, Dr. Antonio Caram, Ruben Reyes, Adriano Consumo, Benito Consumo, Ramon Mallo, Ramon Lachica, Dr. Jose Mabunay, Bernardo Miralles, Ernesto Rosales, Francisco Maldesir, Dr. Jose D. Villamor, Manuel S. Cana-on, Ernesto Baylen, Manuel Palacios, Crisanto Nasion, Antonio Borja, Elpidio Posanas, Roque Javellana, Lydia Gentilezo, Diosdado Muela, Andres Muela, Flavio Zaragosa Cano, Policarpio Dayot, Generoso Gregorio, Dr. Fermin G. Caram, Rubin Reyes and Jose N. Nava.

**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.