

THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF AND APPELLEE VS. AMBROCIO BELEN, ET AL., DEFENDANTS. FAUSTO PERITU, ET AL., DEFENDANTS AND APPELLANTS.*G.R. No. L-13895. September 30, 1963*

Ponente: MAKALINTAL, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/56560eaf41df/>**MAKALINTAL, J.:**

On March 18, 1954 the Provincial Fiscal of La Union filed an information for double murder (of Hilario Zuniega and his wife, Felicisima Peritu), against Ambrosio Belen, Fausto Peritu, Sotero Peritu, Fernando Peritu, Florentino Estipular, Bernardo Estipular, Maximo Delinila, Sotero Banay and Andres Balas. The information was later amended to include Crispulo Mabalo and Florencio Hidalgo as defendants. All the accused pleaded not guilty. After several prosecution witnesses testified, Ambrosio Belen withdrew his former plea and substituted it with a plea of guilty upon re-arraignment on the amended information. He was sentenced by the Court of First Instance of La Union to two separate penalties of reclusion perpetua, and afterwards utilized by the prosecution as witness against the ten other accused. After trial the court found all of them guilty as charged. Each was sentenced to double life imprisonment, to indemnify the heirs of the deceased spouses, jointly and severally with Ambrosio Belen, in the sum of P6,000.00 and to pay the costs.

From said decision the ten accused appealed to this Court. On record are a printed brief for appellants Andres Balas, Maximo Delinila, Florentino Estipular, Bernardo Estipular, Sotero Banay, Sotero Peritu, Fernando Peritu and Fausto Peritu; a separate mimeographed brief for the three Peritus; and a motion filed by counsel de oficio for appellants Crispulo Mabalo and Florencio Hidalgo, stating that from the records of the case there is nothing on which to predicate a good defense that may justify reversal or modifications of the appealed judgment, which motion was considered by this Court as the brief for said appellants.

Undisputed by both prosecutions and defense are these facts: Late in the evening of December 9, 1952 the above named eleven accused, including Ambrosio Belen, went to a brook west of the house of Hilario Zuniega and his second wife Felicisima Peritu, located at barrio Basca, Aringay, La Union. Eight of them remained near the brook, while Ambrosio Belen and the rest (as to whose identities the evidence is conflicting), went up the house. Belen shot Zuniega dead after which his wife was also killed. Then Belen called the others who were by the brook and told them to come up the house, which they did. Belen, Florencio Hidalgo, Andres Balas and the three Peritus (Fausto and his sons Sotero and Fernando) dug a grave some distance from the Zuniega house and there buried the two victims. Then they returned to the Zuniega house and cleaned it of the bloodstains which had been left. Meanwhile, the rest of the accused took the personal belongings of the victims to Balbina Zuniega and Emilia Zuniega, daughters of Hilario Zuniega by his first marriage, who were both staying in the house of Fernando Peritu. The group then went back to the Zuniega house and helped their companions erase all traces of the crime. Afterwards they left the place and went to their respective homes.

Almost a year afterwards, or on November 24, 1953, Lt. Gregorio Hufano, Sgt. Dulay, Sgt. Victoriano C. Tavas,

Cpl. Godoy and Pfc. Ramirez of the Philippine Constabulary went to barrio Basca, Aringay, La Union, to investigate the deaths of Hilario Zuniega and Felicisima Peritu. Among those questioned were Sotero Peritu, Sotero Banay, Florentino Estipular, Bernardo Estipular, Andres Balas, Crispulo Mabalo and Florencio Hidalgo. All of them denied knowledge of the crimes. By means of a clever ruse, [1] however, lay buried. Exhumation was made in the presence of Dr. Viflanueva, the provincial medical officer. In the common grave the investigators found two sets of bones.

Written statements were then secured from Andres Balas, Maximo Delinila, Sotero Banay, Sotero Peritu, Florentino Estipular, Bernardo Estipular (Exhibit A, A-1 to A-5 respectively, all of which, except A-4, were sworn before Ricardo Ordon, Justice of the Peace of Aringay, La Union); from Fausto Peritu, Ambrosio Belen, Fernando Peritu (Exhs. A-6 to A-8, respectively, sworn before Justice of the Peace Pedro O. Arciaga of San Fernando, La Union); and from Florencio Hidalgo (Exhibit 1-Peritu).

The bones which had been exhumed were placed in four bags (Exhs. B, B-1, B-2 and B-3) and turned over to Antonio U. Briones, medico-legal officer of Criminal Investigation Service, Philippine Constabulary, who later submitted a written statement of the result of his analysis (Exhibit C). According to his report, the bones were the incomplete skeletons of two human beings, a male (skeleton No. 1) and a female (skeleton No. 2); "the individual with skeleton No. 1 must have suffered instantaneous death due to severe shock and hemorrhage secondary to the gunshot wound of the head causing multiple fractures of the skull and severe laceration of the brain; substance," and "multiple fractures of the bones on the right lower side of the face must have been due to heavy blows from a heavy blunt instrument;" and "the cause of death (skeleton No. 2) was also due to shock and hemorrhage secondary to a gunshot wound of the right scapula," and "the sharp instrument employed penetrated the scapula, and further caused injury to the 4th rib and probably to the right lung."

With above facts providing the framework, the prosecution built a case against the ten appellants. Evidence was submitted to prove that their criminal participation was voluntary and in pursuance of a preconceived plan. On the other hand, while all of them profess to have acted under intimidation, they are not agreed as to who exerted it. Some aver that Mabalo and Hidalgo had threatened to kill them and their families if they did not help in the commission of the murders. This group consists of the three Peritus, the two Estipulars (the brothers Florentino and Bernardo). Andres Balas, Sotero Banay and Maximo Dalinila. The other group, composed only of Crispulo Mabalo and Florencio Hidalgo, alleges that it was Andres Balas who masterminded the plot to kill the Zuniegas, and who, together with the rest of the accused, threatened Mabalo and Hidalgo to give their assistance.

As proof of conspiracy and deliberate participation of all the accused, the prosecution points to the testimony of Ambrosio Belen and the sworn written statements signed by the appellants.

It appears from six of these statements (Exhs. A, A-1 to A-5)[2] that on December 6, 1952 all the appellants met at a place near the house of Crispulo Mabalo. There Mabalo informed them that the previous night he and a certain Josenna Peritu had been kidnapped by two persons, one of whom he recognized to be Hilario Zuniega, and convinced them that if Zuniega was not killed they would also be in danger of kidnapping.

Ambrosio Belen was not present during the meeting, but it seems that Mabalo chose him as the triggerman. What Belen testified to was as to what happened on December 9, 1952. He declared: At four in the afternoon of said day Mabalo, armed with a bolo, went to see him at Ms house in barrio Sili, Naguilian, La Union, and took him to Mabalo's house in barrio Basca, Aringay, La Union, where they found Mabalo's wife preparing supper. Mabalo then left the house and was out for some time. Upon his return they ate supper, after which Mabalo took Belen to the house of Florencio Hidalgo, where they found the three Peritus, the two Estipulars, Delinila, Hidalgo, Balas and Banay. After eating there, all of them went to a place southeast of Banay's house. He obeyed Mabalo, Belen

said, because Mabalo, who had a gun, threatened to to kill him. A few meters before they reached the house near the brook, Mabalo handed him a rifle. On going inside the house with Mabalo, he saw sleeping side by side an old man and a woman, who he later learned were Hilario Zuniega and his wife Felicisima Peritu. Because he was afraid of Mabalo, he shot and killed the old man, while Mabalo in turn shot the woman so she would not live to identify them. In compliance with Mabalo's order, Belen called their companions who were waiting by the creek. Mabalo told some of them to dig a grave and bury the victims. Belen did not help inter them, but left shortly after the killing. On his way home to barrio Sili, he threw the murder gun into a river which he had to cross.

While from the testimony of Belen it appears that Mabalo and Hidalgo were largely responsible for the killings, Hidalgo insists he was threatened by both Ambrosio Belen and Andres Balas, and Mabalo avers it was Belen who threatened him.

Hidalgo testified: In the evening of December 9, 1952, when he was already sleeping, the three Peritus—Fausto, Fernando and Sotero—came to his house, woke him up and told him that Andres Balas needed his help in recovering Balas' carabao, which, according to the three, had fallen from a precipice. When he went with them, however, they took him to the house of Zuniega, where he saw the corpses of Zuniega and his wife. The fact that Balas and Belen were both armed so scared him, Hidalgo said, that he did not inquire into the cause of their deaths. In compliance with orders from Fernando Peritu, Fausto Peritu and Balas, he helped them carry the two corpses from the house. Then they dug a pit, placed the bodies inside and covered them with a bloodstained mat and then with earth. On the way from the grave back to the Zuniega house, he saw Mabalo sitting on a dike, but they did not talk to each other.

Mabalo testified: On the night in question he was awakened by the shouts of Belen, who asked him to come down because they were going somewhere. At first he refused, reasoning out that he was tired, but Belen threatened him with a gun, so he went along. He recognized Maximo Delinila among Belen's companions. They passed for Sotero Banay and Andres Balas, after which they went westward to the house of Hilario Zuniega. Upon Belen's orders he, Banay and some of the others remained by the brook, some twenty meters from the house, while Belen, Balas and Delinila went towards the road leading to the Zuniega place. The house being on a higher elevation than the brook, Mabalo saw a flashlight illuminate the front of the house, and a moment later heard three gunshots fired by Belen, who was then standing in front of the door. Belen called to him and his companions waiting by the brook, but Mabalo did not budge from his place and stayed there for four hours, during which time he saw the light move inside the house and heard the commotion going on there. He saw Belen, Balas, Banay and Delinila carry out the dead Zuniega and, a little later, Felicisima. Belen told him to wait on top of a dike and watch for persons who might unexpectedly come, so he sat on the dike for about three hours. It was already dawn of the next day before Belen let him go home, warning him not to "squeal" or he would be killed.

The eight other appellants present the defense that they helped bury the victims and dispose of their belonging because of threats made by Belen, Mabalo and Hidalgo. The aggregate of their testimony is to the following effect: In the early evening of December 9, 1952 Hidalgo came to fetch Fausto Peritu from his house at barrio Basca. Because Hidalgo told him there was a P.C. lieutenant waiting for him in Hidalgo's house, Fausto went with Hidalgo. On the way, they passed for his son Fernando Peritu. However, they failed to find any P.C. lieutenant in Hidalgo's house. Hidalgo asked them to wait a while, so they sat in the yard after Hidalgo had lighted a lamp and placed it on top of a mortar.

At about the same time Mabalo and Belen were rounding up the other appellants. First, they went to the house of Sotero Peritu, whom Mabalo woke up. Sotero went with the two because Mabalo threatened him with death. Then they proceeded to the houses of Bernardo Estipular, Florentino Estipular, Delinila and Balas, in that order. In each place, Mabalo made his companions wait in the yard while he threatened each appellant into joining the group.

Mabalo took them to the house of Hidalgo, who was there waiting with Fausto Peritu and Fernando Peritu. Mabalo ordered Hidalgo, his cousin-in-law, to bring his companions along and instructed Belen to watch the seven of them and to shoot any one of them who would attempt to escape. The group, headed by Mabalo, passed for Sotero Banay, whom Mabalo also intimidated into joining them. They went westward until they reached a brook where the eight appellants were made to wait while Belen, Hidalgo and Mabalo went towards the footpath leading to Zuniesra's house. Suddenly, they heard two gunshots coming from the house, after which they heard Belen cursing and shouting at them to come up the house. They were too afraid to move, but a third shot fired by Belen prodded them into going to the Zuniega house. There they saw Belen, Mabalo and Hidalgo, and the dead bodies of Zuniega and his wife. Mabalo ordered the three Peritus and Andres Balas to dig a grave. Hidalgo handed to them a shovel and a crowbar for that purpose. These four appellants, after digging the grave, then interred the victims, while Hidalgo held a lamp and Belen pointed a gun at them.

In the meantime, Mabalo ordered Delinila, Banay and the two Estipulars to take the victims personal belongings to the house of Fernando Peritu, where Zuniega's two daughters, Emilia and Balbina, were staying. These four appellants waited downstairs while Mabalo went up the house and apprised Zuniega's daughters of the death of their father and stepmother. At Mabalo's orders these four appellants brought up the personal belongings of the victims. Before leaving the house Mabalo warned Emilia and Balbina not to talk about his having killed their father. Back at Zuniega's house Mabalo ordered Delinila, Banay and the Estipulars to help Balas and the three Peritus, who were washing the gore off the floor of the house. After they finished, Mabalo allowed them to go home, warning them not to report to the authorities.

Since appellants admit their presence at and participation in the commission of the crimes, the only issue is whether or not the same was voluntary, deliberate and in pursuance of a criminal conspiracy. In view of the conflicting theories presented by the two groups of appellants, it is apparent that either or both must be false.

Let us consider the version given by Mabalo and Hidalgo. To support Mabalo's defense, Hidalgo alleged that he saw Mabalo sitting on a dike and even talked to him. But shortly thereafter he contradicted himself by declaring that he never talked to Mabalo, his cousin-in-law, although he passed quite close to him. And while Mabalo testified that he never saw Hidalgo, the latter claimed that he saw the former three times during the night in question—first, before the Peritus came to fetch him, he saw Mabalo sitting on a dike under the acacia tree near Zuniega's house; next he saw Mabalo on the same dike when he and the Peritus came from his house and were going to Zuniega's house; and then he saw Mabalo still sitting on the dike when they returned for Felicisima's corpse. From what Hidalgo stated it would appear that Mabalo remained seated on the dike all the time, but Mabalo declared that he first waited by the brook and it was only when Felicisima's corpse was being carried from the house that Belen ordered him to stay on the dike. Belen would hardly have taken the trouble of fetching him from his house only to ask him to do nothing but stay near the creek and then sit on a dike, as if just to have an eyewitness to the burial of the victims.

To show that Belen could not have eaten supper at Mabalo's house, the latter's wife, Concepcion, declared that on the night in question she was too sick to stand up, much less cook supper. If she were really that ill, it was unlikely that Mabalo would leave her alone in the house the whole night without even telling her that he was going out and where. He could have used her illness as an excuse for not going with Belen, there being no one else who could stay with her. Yet he did not even tell Belen that his wife was sick. Instead, his reason for refusing, at first, to go with Belen, was that he was very tired.

Mabalo said he did not inform his wife that he was going out with Belen, and even upon his return gave her no explanation for having stayed out the whole night. This is quite incredible. She must have known beforehand where he was going, the idea for the murders having been hatched at the house three days before they were

committed.

As regards Hidalgo, it is noteworthy that in his sworn statement, Exhibit 1 Peritu, he claimed it was Andres Balas who woke him up and persuaded him to go with Andres and the three Peritus; and that while they were already on their way to Zuniega's house he heard three shots. On the witness stand, however, he declared that it was only the three Peritus who came for him and took him to Zuniega's house, where he found Zuniega and his wife already dead.

Ambrosio Belen's testimony clearly shows that Mabalo and Hidalgo were the main instigators of the plot. It was at Hidalgo's house that all the other appellants met preparatory to their going to Zuniega's house to execute the agreed plan. The appellants are there, so Hidalgo must have seen to it that enough food was prepared. This indicates, beyond peradventure of doubt, that he had foreknowledge of the plot. Mabalo was the one who secured the presence of the chosen triggerman, Belen, at the proper time, even going to the extent of fetching Belen from barrio Sili. Mabalo was the one who killed Felicisima Peritu. Her wounds more or less tallied with Belen's statement that Mabalo was armed with a bolo when he came to barrio Sili in the afternoon before the murders. For she sustained not only a gunshot wound (on the collarbone) but also one inflicted with a sharp instrument, which penetrated the scapula and injured the fourth rib and probably the lung. Also, as proven by testimony of Emilia Zuniega, who testified for the other defendants, Mabalo headed the group which brought her father's and stepmother's personal belongings to her and her sister Balbina.

There is no reason for doubting Belen. No improper motive has been attributed to him. If he had been prejudiced at all it should have been against the other appellants, not against Mabalo whom he knew very well. Belen used to work in Mabalo's fields and had even boarded with him during harvest time. On the other hand, he seems to have been barely familiar with the other eight appellants.

Furthermore, other than for the fact that Mabalo asked him to kill Zuniega, Belen had no reason to wish Zuniega dead. Mabalo on the other hand, had such motive. He believed that Zuniega was responsible for his having been kidnapped together with Josefina Peritu. In addition to this, as testified by Emilia Zuniega, Mabalo had quarrelled with her father about the use of water for irrigation purposes. In his plot he included not only Hidalgo, his cousin-in-law, but also the other eight appellants who also had reasons for joining the conspiracy.. Besides Mabalo's statement to them that they might also be kidnapped by Zuniega, they had their own individual motives. Josefina Peritu, who had been kidnapped with Mabalo, is the daughter of Fausto Peritu and the sister of Fernando Peritu and Sotero Peritu. Andres Balas, Florentino Estipular and Maximo Delinila bore a grudge against Hilario Zuniega because he prevented them from measuring the property they had bought from Hilario's son, Alvaro, which property adjoined that of Hilario. Bernardo Estipular was involved because of his brother Florentino, while Sotero Banay joined the plea because of his uncle Hidalgo.

For objective reasons the version of the eight appellants (except Hidalgo and Mabalo) must likewise be rejected. Belen affirmed that when he and Mabalo arrived at Hidalgo's house they found said appellants already there.

This disproves their assertion that it was Mabalo who rounded them up one by one from their house. Considering that barrio Basca (and the surrounding area) is mountainous, inaccessible except by foot, and sparsely populated, with the houses of the eight appellants far apart from each other, [3] it would have taken Belen and Mabalo the greater part of the night to recruit each appellant from his house. It is more reasonable to believe Belen's statement that they all gathered together voluntarily at Hidalgo's house which was three kilometers from Fausto Peritu's house. It is more reasonable to believe Belen's statement that they all gathered voluntarily at Hidalgo's place and even ate supper there. This fact indicates a pre-arranged plan. If, as may be inferred from the story of these eight appellants, Belen, Mabalo and Hidalgo merely needed help to bury the victims and dispose of their belongings, they would hardly have gone to the extent of intimidating as many as eight unwilling helpers when half the

number, or even less, would have sufficed for the purpose. The more people they threatened, the less effective would be the threat and the more witnesses there would be to the crimes, and hence the greater danger of discovery and apprehension. The only logical and credible explanation is that all the appellants were moved by a common sentiment and acted in accordance with a pre-arranged plan. This is the only explanation for the fact that although they were left by the creek, with nobody watching them, they made no attempt to escape, for they were there to stand guard and to help bury the victims after the killing.

The acts of the eight appellants (except Hidalgo and Mabalo) in voluntarily meeting at Hidalgo's house; their standing watch by the creek; their helping to bury the bodies of the victims; their cooperating to dispose of the latter's belongings and their erasing all traces of the crimes, prove that they had conspired with Mabalo and Hidalgo.

"Conspiracies need not be established by direct evidence of the acts charged, but may and generally must be proved by a number of indefinite acts, conditions and circumstances which vary according to the purpose to be accomplished. The very existence of a conspiracy is generally a matter of inference deduced from certain acts of the persons accused, done in pursuance of an apparently criminal or unlawful purpose in common between them. The existence of the agreement or joint assent of the minds need not, be proved directly. It may be inferred by the jury from other facts proved. It is not necessary to prove that the defendants came together and actually agreed in terms to have the unlawful purpose, and to pursue it by common means. If it be proved that the defendants pursued by their acts the same object, often by the same means, one performing one part and another part of the same so as to complete it, with a view to the attainment of the same object, the jury will be justified in the conclusion that they were engaged in a conspiracy to effect that object. If, therefore, one concurs in a conspiracy, no proof of agreement to concur is necessary in order to make him guilty. His participation in the conspiracy may be established without showing his name or giving his description. *People vs. Colman*, L-6652 to 6654, February 28, 1958.

Furthermore, we have the sworn statements made by all eight appellants (Exhibits A, A-1 to A-6 and A-8) all of which, except those of Fausto and Fernando Peritu are self-incriminating. Appellants now assail their sworn statements on two grounds; (1) that they are inadmissible as evidence because they were signed under threat and intimidation and without affiant's knowledge of their contents ; and (2) that the prosecution failed to establish the requisites so that each statement may be used against the other appellant who were not signers thereof.

Let us consider the first objectives. Appellants declared that they were subjected to maltreatment by certain constabulary soldiers in order to force them to sign the affidavits: Andres Balas said he was thrice ordered to "squats on air" and kicked on the left side. Florentino Estipular said that for two hours, which his body bent at the waist as he was made to hold his ankles with his hands he was required to stay under the sun. Bernardo Estipular testified that with arms outstretched he was made made to kneel on pebbles for thirty minutes and that whenever he fell he was hit on the knees and arms. Sotero Banay had to stand on tiptoe for thirty minutes, also with arms outstretched. Fernando Peritu was boxed, then hit on the left ear so that he fell unconscious. Sotero Peritu was also made to squat and was given fist blows three times by Sgt. Tavas. Fausto Peritu was also made to "squat on air" for two hours. Maximo Delinila said that for about thirty minutes he was made to bend and hold a bottle placed on the floor, while turning clockwise at the same time.

Appellant's story of maltreatment must be discarded. They said they were investigated not inside the schoolbuilding of Basca but in the schoolyard, a space open to public view. The spectacle of men being subjected to the interesting "tortures" described by appellants certainly would have attracted the attention not only of their relatives but also of other barrio folk. Yet not a single witness was presented to corroborate appellant's story.

The P.C. men who investigated appellants categorically declared that they did not maltreat or threaten the appellants. Ricardo Ordon and Pedro Arciaga, the justices of the peace before whom appellants appeared,

testified that appellants voluntarily swore to their statements after the same had been read and translated to them. Each of the statements contains details which only the affiant thereof could have known. In the case of Fernando Peritu and Fausto Peritu, their respective statements contain practically nothing incriminatory, the same being more or less similar to those they made in court. It is unreasonable to think that the P.C. men would employ intimidation only to obtain from these two the kind of statements they actually made. And while some of the appellants claimed to have been physically assaulted, none appears to have complained to the proper authorities, nor is there any medical certificate attesting to whatever injuries they may have suffered.

In their respective sworn statements, appellants Balas (Exh. A); Delinila (Exh. A-1); Sotero Banay (Exh. A-2); Sotero Peritu (Exh. A-3); Florentino Estipular (Exh. A-4); and Bernardo Estipular (Exh. A-5) alleged that three days before the murders were committed there was a meeting under the santol tree in the yard of Crispulo Mabalo; and they admitted that they took part in the discussion of the plan to kill Zuniega and his wife. While some declared in their statements that they were somewhat reluctant, nonetheless they were finally persuaded into taking part in the plot. These individual admissions are binding on the respective affiants and show beyond doubt their complicity in the plot. As for Fernando Peritu, Fausto Peritu, Crispulo Mabalo and Florencio Hidalgo, their actions, as already related, prove their participation in the conspiracy beyond doubt. Conspiracy having been established, each of the statements (Exh. A, A-1 to A-5) is admissible against all the conspirators, and each is responsible for the crimes committed as a result.

The Solicitor General, on the ground that the aggravating circumstances of evident premeditation, superior strength and dwelling attended the commission of the crimes, recommends the imposition of the death penalty and the increase of the civil indemnity from P6,000.00 for the two victims to P6,000.00 for each of them. The aggravating circumstance of abuse of superior strength is absorbed by the qualifying circumstance of treachery (People vs. Guarnes, 110 Phil., 379.) The existence of conspiracy presupposes evident premeditation (People vs. Timbang and Mallarin, 74 Phil. 295), which, together with the circumstance of dwelling, should be appreciated against appellants. However, the death penalty should not be imposed since they have not shown that degree of perversity that would justify imposition thereof. Nevertheless the death indemnity should be raised to P6,000.00 for each victim (People vs. Davis, 111 Phil. 67).

Wherefore, modified only with respect to the indemnity, which should be in the sum of P6,000.00 to the heirs of each of the two victims, the judgment appealed from is affirmed, with costs.

Bengzon, C. J., Padilla, Bautista Angelo, Labrador, Concepcion, Barrera, Paredes, Dizon and Regala, JJ. concur.

[1] Lt. Hufano succeeded in making Hidalgo point out to him the place where the victims Lt. Hufano told Hidalgo that his companions had—although they had not—revealed that he was one of those who had buried the Zuniega's. Believing that the other had disclosed what they knew, Hidalgo readily pointed to the common grave.

[2] Appellants Fausto Peritu and his son Fernando made no mention in their statements (Exhs. A-6 and A-8, respectively) of a conspiracy. As a matter of fact some of their allegations tend to be exculpatory.

[3] Of this group of appellants only Fausto Peritu and Fernando Peritu lived in Basca. The other six appellants lived in barrio Balebec, Naguilian, La Union, (as did Hidalgo), which is three kilometers from Basca. Mabalo and the victims lived in Basca, while Belen was from barrio Sili, Naguilian. Mabalo's house was one-half kilometer from Zuniega's house; one kilometer from Hidalgo's house; one kilometer from Bahay's house; and two kilometers from Belen's house. Florentino Estipular's house was one kilometer from Zuniega's house, while

Hidalgo's house was one kilometers from Fausto Peritu'shouse.

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.