

MILAGROS DE LA CRUZ, PETITIONER, VS. HON. JUDGE BIENVENIDO EJERCITO, COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF PAMPANGA AND ANGELES CITY, BRANCH IV; TEODORO DAVID, CITY FISCAL OF ANGELES CITY,...

G.R. No. L-40895. November 06, 1975

Ponente: AQUINO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/91c8be887b90/>

AQUINO, J.:

On May 20, 1974 Milagros de la Cruz was charged with bigamy in the Court of First Instance of Pampanga, Angeles City Branch IV for having married Sergeant Dominick L. Gaccino on September 15, 1973 while her prior marriage to Teodoro G. David was undissolved. The information was filed at the instance of her first husband (Criminal Case No. 3128).

On August 1, 1974 Milagros de la Cruz filed in the same court at its San Fernando Branch III a complaint for the annulment of her marriage to Sergeant Gaccino on the ground of duress (Civil Case No. 4188).

Defendant Gaccino did not answer the complaint. Judge Mariano Castañeda, Jr. ordered the Provincial Fiscal to investigate whether there was a collusion between the parties. A special counsel of the Fiscal's office reported that there was no collusion.

On December 16, 1974 Judge Castañeda rendered a decision annulling the marriage of Milagros de la Cruz to Gaccino. No appeal was taken from that decision. It became final. In view of the annulment of her second marriage, Milagros de la Cruz filed on January 27, 1975 a motion to dismiss the bigamy charge. The private prosecutor and the prosecuting fiscal opposed the motion.

Judge Bienvenido Ejercito denied it in his order of May 27, 1975 on the ground that the decision in the annulment case is not controlling in the criminal case because the parties and the issues in the two cases are not the same.

That refusal of Judge Ejercito to dismiss the bigamy case, notwithstanding the judicial pronouncement that her second marriage was a nullity, prompted Milagros de la Cruz to file the instant special civil action of certiorari and prohibition.

The issue is whether the bigamy case became moot or untenable after the second marriage, on which the prosecution for bigamy is based, was annulled.

The City Fiscal of Angeles City contends that the lower court acted correctly in denying the motion to dismiss the bigamy charge. He argues that the decision in the annulment case should be set up as a defense by Milagros de la Cruz during the trial and that it would not justify the outright dismissal of the criminal case.

On the other hand, the Solicitor General manifested that the stand of Milagros de la Cruz should be sustained because one element of bigamy is that the alleged marriage, having all the requisites, would be valid were it not for the subsistence of the first marriage (People vs. Mora Dumpo, 62 Phil. 246, 248; Merced vs. Hon. Diez, 109

Phil. 155; Zapanta vs. Montesa, 114 Phil. 1227).

We hold that the finding in the annulment case that the second marriage contracted by Milagros de la Cruz with Sergeant Gaccino was a nullity is determinative of her innocence and precludes the rendition of a verdict that she committed bigamy. To try the criminal case in the face of such a finding would be unwarranted.

As noted by Groizard, it is essential "que el segundo matrimonio 'ha de constituir un acto solemne en que concurren los requisitos exigidos para la existencia del sacramento o del contrato'" (2 Cuello Calon, Derecho Penal, 12[th] ed., p. 675, note 2). As pointed out in the Merced case, *supra*, it is necessary in a prosecution for bigamy that the second marriage be declared valid if its validity was questioned in a civil action.

And even supposing *arguendo* that the decree annulling the second marriage was questionable or erroneous because it was issued in a judgment by default, still that would not prevent the decree from having legal effect. "An erroneous judgment is not a void judgment" (*Chereau vs. Fuentebella*, 43 Phil. 216).

WHEREFORE, the lower court's order of May 27, 1975, denying the motion to dismiss of Milagros de la Cruz, is set aside. The writ of prohibition is granted. No costs.

SO ORDERED.

Barredo, (Acting Chairman), Antonio, Concepcion, Jr., and Martin, JJ., concur.

Fernando, J., is on leave.

Martin, J., was designated to sit in the Second Division.

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.