

THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PETITIONER, VS. FELICIDAD C. VILLALON, AS DISTRICT JUDGE, COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE, BRANCH II, DAGUPAN CITY, ALFREDO DE VERA, AS MUNICIPAL JUDGE OF...

G.R. No. L-45749. August 16, 1985

Ponente: ALAMPAY, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/7eaa3d7434a6/>

ALAMPAY, J.:

This case was originally instituted in this Tribunal by the petitioner, Alicia G. Decano, as Assistant Provincial Fiscal of Pangasinan, asking Us to settle the question as to which court has jurisdiction to try a case for violation of gambling laws where there are several accused involved, one of whom is alleged to be the Banker, another a Maintainer and the rest mere bettors in the prohibited game. In the Resolution of this Court, dated March 14, 1977, the title of this case was ordered changed so as to have the People of the Philippines correctly appear as the petitioner.

On March 15, 1976, the Station Commander of Calasiao, Pangasinan charged the private respondents herein before the Municipal Court of said town for Violation of Article 195 of the Revised Penal Code. The complaint against the accused was later amended on June 3, 1976, to rectify an inadvertent omission as to the date of the commission of said offense. (Amended Complaint, Annex "A" of Petition, Rollo, p. 21).

The amended complaint points to Francisco Sendayen y de Vera as the Maintainer-operator, Roland Gonzales y Macaalay as the Banker, and the rest of the accused as bettors in the prohibited game of "Lucky 9".

On June 26, 1976, the accused, who are now the private respondents in the case at bar, filed a motion to quash the criminal case lodged against them, contending that more than one offense is charged in the complaint, one of which would fall within the original exclusive jurisdiction of the Municipal Court while the other falls within the exclusive original jurisdiction of the then Court of First Instance, on account of the penalties that may be imposed on the respective accused. It was thus averred that two separate criminal complaints should have been filed, one in the Municipal Court and the other in the then Court of First Instance.

The Assistant Provincial Fiscal opposed said motion to quash on the ground that the complaint actually charges but one offense and that is the Violation of Article 19125 of the Revised Penal Code. And on the fact that the highest imposable penalty is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Court of First Instance, it was the submission of the prosecution that the Municipal Court should only conduct a preliminary investigation and thereafter remand the case to the Court of First Instance for further proceedings.

In an order dated July 21, 1976, respondent Municipal Judge directed the prosecution to either file an amended information excluding the alleged Banker and Maintainer or to proceed with the trial of the case with respect to the accused bettors but excluding the alleged Banker and Maintainer from the formal charges, as the penalties for which the latter two may be held liable can be imposed only by a Court of First Instance. Petitioner filed a motion

for reconsideration of the said Order which was, however, denied by respondent Municipal Judge on August 9, 1976.

Assistant Provincial Fiscal Alicia G. Decano thereupon filed a petition for certiorari and mandamus in the Court of First Instance of Pangasinan, Branch II, presided over by respondent District Judge Felicidad C. Villalon. In said petition, she prays that the questioned Order of the Municipal Court dated July 21, 1976 be vacated and that the respondent Municipal Judge be ordered to conduct a preliminary investigation and, thereafter, remand the gambling case to the Court of First Instance should the evidence received so warrant.

Resolving the case, the respondent Judge of the Court of First Instance dismissed the petition for certiorari and mandamus on December 29, 1976, stating as reasons therefor, the following:

"This Court finds nothing wrong with the Order as the Municipal Judge has acted within his jurisdiction considering that under the Judiciary Act of 1948 violation of the Gambling Laws falls within the original jurisdiction of the Municipal Court and considering that the penalty for a banker or maintainer set forth under Art. 195 of the RPC exceeds the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court, preliminary investigation can be had as the Municipal Court has to proceed, as directed, with the trial of the case on the merits over the bettors.

"The Municipal Court then has not abused its judicial discretion. There could not be splitting the causes of action because the trial of the case with regards to the alleged bettors clearly pertains to the Municipal Court, whereas with regards to the alleged banker or maintainer, with the Court of First Instance and, as directed, considering the different imposable penalties, the complaints could be separated if the evidence of the prosecution warrants.

"WHEREFORE, premises considered, this Court hereby orders the petition dismissed and hereby orders the criminal case of which the Municipal Judge voluntarily suspended to proceed as directed." (Annex "C" of Petition, Rollo, pp. 39-41).

Gambling is one of the offenses included in Section 87 (b) of the Judiciary Act of 1948, as amended. It is this Act — Rep. Act 296, as amended, which at that time governed and determined the jurisdiction of the various courts. Under said section, municipal courts would have original jurisdiction with respect to the bettors in view of the imposable penalty and concurrent jurisdiction with Courts of First Instance with respect to the Maintainers and Bankers considering the higher penalty prescribed by law for them.

In the case of *People vs. Nazareno*, 70 SCRA 531, it has been clearly stated that —

"(1) There is the concurrent jurisdiction over the eleven offenses (gambling, assaults, larceny, etc.) enumerated in paragraph (b) formerly (c) of section 87 as long as the penalty exceeds six months' imprisonment or a fine of P200.00 (*People vs. Pamon*, infra; *People vs. Laba*, infra; *People vs. Valencia*, L-29396, August 29, 1969, 29 SCRA 252; *People vs. Tapayan*, L-26885, November 28, 1969, 30 SCRA 529).

"There is no maximum limit as to the penalty to which the concurrent jurisdiction extends in those eleven crimes. The inferior court's jurisdiction over these offenses is independent of the penalty." (*Natividad vs. Roblen*, 87 Phil. 834).

As it is axiomatic that the court first acquiring jurisdiction excludes the other courts (*Laguian vs. Baltazar*, 31 SCRA 551) then in the instant case, it would be the Municipal Court of Calasiao, Pangasinan where the criminal complaint was initially filed that should hear and decide the gambling case, excluding any other court from obtaining jurisdiction over said case and regardless of the varying penalties that maybe imposed on the different accused.

The contention of the Assistant Provincial Fiscal that the Municipal Court should only conduct a preliminary

investigation and remand the case to the Court of First Instance for further proceedings is clearly untenable for lack of any legal basis whatsoever.

WHEREFORE, the Court resolved to SET ASIDE the Resolution of the Respondent District Judge, dated December 29, 1976 rendered in Civil Case No. 3757 insofar as it declares that the case against the accused Francisco Sendayen y de Vera and Rolando Gonzales y Macaalay, alleged Maintainer-operator and Banker, respectively, in the stated gambling case — Criminal Case No. 062-76, be the subject of a preliminary investigation by the Municipal Court and for remand of the case to the Court of First Instance should his investigation so warrants. The Municipal Court of Calasiao, Pangasinan, is hereby directed to proceed with the trial of Criminal Case No. 062-76 against all the accused named in the complaint and thereafter decide said case on the merits.

No costs.

SO ORDERED.

Aquino, (Chairman), Concepcion, Jr., Escolin, and Cuevas, JJ., concur.

Abad Santos, J., on leave.

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.