

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. ZOSIMO EQUIPILAG, LIBERATO BAYOTLANG AND RICARDO BAYOTLANG, ACCUSED-APPELLANTS.*G.R. No. L-21960. October 18, 1977*Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/afbe6f7d2a9f/>**PER CURIAM:**

This is a review of the decision dated July 26, 1963 of the Court of First Instance of Bohol, Branch I, in criminal case 3670, convict-ing the herein appellants Zosimo Equipilag, Liberato Bayotlang and Ricardo Bayotlang of robbery with homicide under article 294(1) of the Revised Penal Code and sentencing them to death in view of the presence of the aggravating circumstances of dwelling, nighttime and abuse of superior strength.

The acts imputed to the appellants occurred inside the house of the spouses Isidoro and Filomena Orillosa situated in barrio Calunasan, municipality of Calape, province of Bohol. Filomena Orillosa narrated on the witness stand that in the wee hours of March 29, 1963 she was awakened on hearing her husband, then in a room adjoining hers, ask what it was that dropped. After she replied that it might be a cat, Isidoro rejoined: "Please light the lamp in our room because it is very dark." As she stood up to do so, she was confronted by a man holding a revolver and a flashlight. The intruder pointed his gun at Filomena and asked where her money was. On being given a box with P10.00 inside, the intruder pointed his gun once more at Filomena and, pulling her blouse violently, asked if that was all she had. The man then entered the room where Isidoro was. When Filomena who followed the intruder was about to leave the room, she saw him, upon turning her face, shoot her husband while the latter stood with his hands raised. The robber then turned to her, saying: "Get out or I will shoot you." She hurried to the living room with her head bent down. When she raised her head, the culprit hit her face with the revolver. He also shot her but missed.

Meanwhile, someone from outside demanded that the door be opened. The intruder inside, after hitting Filomena a second time, ordered her to open the door; a second man, with a revolver and flashlight in hand, entered and, going to a room inside, ordered Filomena to open the wardrobe and suitcases there. The man got P7.00. Asked for more, Filomena handed to the second intruder the pants of her husband which contained P150.00 and also gave her wallet which contained P100.00. She then went back to the living room where her daughters Gabriela, Wenefreda and Democrita, her niece Anastacia Josol, a 10-year old nephew, Qesario Josol, and a cousin of her husband, Leonides Erbolengo, were herded.

In the middle of the living room was an image of the Sacred Heart of Jesus which at the time was illumined by a small lamp with a small wick.

When the first intruder asked Filomena's children for their money Filomena answered that they had no more money left, which prompted the man to remark: "I do not believe that is the only money you have. The Calape people told me that you are rich." Filomena replied: "It is true that we could make a little money, but that little money we make is not even enough to defray the expenses for the two students we have in Cebu." The robber then asked the children where their watches were. Filomena's daughters pointed to their wardrobes. The first

intruder got the keys and asported two wristwatches. At about that same moment, Filomena heard two male voices downstairs, one saying, "Continue skinning Bay," and the other answering, "No more Bay."

Shortly thereafter, the second robber went to the dining room and opened the cabinets there. Meanwhile, the first man, who was watching the inmates of the house, told them he did not believe that they had no more money and valuables left. One of the girls replied: "Even if you will kill us, Manoy (used when addressing an older person), those are the things and money we have." The culprit took Filomena's youngest daughter to the dining room and trussed her up. In the mean-time a male voice down below was heard to say, "Go ahead Bay, we have no more seeds here."

At this juncture, the inmates who were in the living room were ordered to enter another room, and the first intruder said, "Watch out, if the P.C. arrives here and overtakes us you will all be liquidated." Later, the victims were herded back to the sala near the image of the Sacred Heart. Filomena heard a male voice say that they were leaving. At about this time, the second culprit went downstairs while the first ordered the offended parties to go inside one of the rooms. This man then closed the door, put out the lamp in the sala, and immediately stepped out of the house.

Noting that the culprits were gone, the children shouted: "Tia Posang, Tio Tasio, please bring us light because we do not have light here." A neighbor who responded found Isidoro dead. According to Filomena, the robbery caused the family, aside from the loss of her husband's life, the loss of P500.00 in cash and valuables, and a radio, four pairs of earrings, two bracelets, four necklaces, three rings and two wristwatches, all with an estimated value of P1,000.00.

Filomena's narrative was corroborated by her daughter Gabriela, then a third-year medical student. She testified that on that early morning she heard her father ask for a box of matches. A short time later she also heard a gun report. She then went up to their window and shouted for help. She heard somebody knock on the door of the room where she, her sisters and other relatives were, and when she opened it a man (the one whom Filomena first met) got inside and told her and her companions to repair to the living room. There, this man got their keys and after opening a cabi-net and finding nothing asked Gabriela and the others for their money. Gabriela replied that they had no money because they were mere students. On hearing this, the man brandished his guy and threatened to kill them. While this intruder was making further threats, Gabriela heard gunfire downstairs, and somebody outside the house said, "We have no more seeds, Bay." She also heard another male voice say, "Let them sleep, Bay."

The relevant issues raised in this appeal are:

1. whether it was at all likely, considering the means of livelihood and moral reputation of the appellants, that they perpetrated the crimes complained of;
2. whether the environmental circumstances obtaining during the commission of the offenses were such as to enable the victims thereof to identify or recognize the offenders;
3. whether the appellants during their subsequent detention were in fact identified by the offended victims;
4. whether the failure of the military authorities concerned to subject the appellants to a paraffin test after they were arrested and to recover from them the articles stolen from the Orillosa family militate against a finding of guilt.

1. Relative to the first issue, counsel for the defense maintains that the appellants could not have perpetrated the crime of robbery with homicide because (a) Liberato Bayotlang, 33 years old, a Catholic, married with three

children, a resident of barrio Atsila, municipality of Ubay, province of Bohol, cultivated a four-hectare rice farm owned by his father from which he obtained an annual share of about 40 cavans of palay; Liberato furthermore engaged in the business of selling precious stones, together with his co-appellants Ricardo and Zosimo, in which venture they went to various places in Bohol, Leyte and Mindanao, and had municipal permits from the authorities concerned; (b) Ricardo Bayotlang, 45 years old, a Catholic, married with two children, a barriomate of his uncle Liberato, was also a farmer cultivating a seven-hectare rice farm from which he derived from 40 to 80 cavans of palay every harvest; (c) Zosimo Equipilag, 39 years old, a Catholic, married, a resident of barrio Camambugan, Ubay, Bohol and a tenant of Ricardo Bayotlang, obtained more than 15 cavans of palay and corn as his annual share, and was also engaged in fishing from which he earned P30.00 to P40.00 a month; his wife earned P5.00 weekly as a mat-weaver; and he was also a helper of Ricardo and Liberato in carrying pigs and chickens that were bartered for precious stones, which the latter peddled in various places; and (d) the appellants were of good moral character for they had never been charged with any offense, and, as testified to by the chief of police and the vice-mayor of Ubay, they had never been reported to be in possession of deadly weapons.

That a person cultivated a small farm and, during off seasons, peddled precious stones may, indeed, have weight in the overall determination of whether such a person had a propensity to commit robbery, especially in a far-flung place. We are not persuaded, however, that for those reasons the appellants should be acquitted of the crime charged, particularly where the level of earnings of the appellants cannot be said to be such as to foreclose entirely the probability that they would rob a house in a rural area. Their incomes, considering the size of the families they supported, did not place them even in the middle economic level, judged by rural standards, as to make a reasonable man conclude that they would absolutely entertain no thought of robbing another person's house in another town.

Likewise, the fact that the appellants were never reported as persons who possessed deadly weapons is no guarantee that they had no such weapons. Nor does the fact that they have never been accused of any offense before constitute a warranty that the appellants have not committed or could not have committed robbery with homicide. Nonetheless, the good moral character of an accused person does have weight in the total appreciation of the evidence in a criminal case, such as the one at bar, and we have duly taken note of the evidence adduced by the defense on the appellants' moral character.

2. On the second issue, the appellants insist that on March 4, 1963, they went for the first time to Calape, Bohol, to peddle precious stones and secured a mayor's permit for the purpose. They stayed there for five days, visiting the barrios of Candungao and Masonoy where they boarded in the house of one named Emang. In that trip Ricardo realized P40.00 in cash, and Liberato P50.00 in cash with P15.00 on credit. They also received a pig and six chickens. Zosimo received P20.00 as compensation.

On March 12, 1963, Ricardo and Liberato returned to Calape to sell precious stones. They boarded in the same house of Emang in Masonoy and returned home on March 16. In that trip, they realized P40.00 of which P10.00 was on credit.

On March 22, 1963, the three appellants traveled once more to Calape to sell precious stones. According to Liberato, they stayed in the house of his "cumpadre" in Masonoy, but according to Zosimo they stayed in Candungao. In this trip, Zosimo realized P15.00 and Ricardo P70.00 in cash. On March 28, 1963, while the trio were in a restaurant in Calape, they met Pio de la Peña, a barriomate and close relative of the appellants. Pio joined them in the appellants' boarding place as Pio expressed a desire to go home with them to Ubay the next day. In the evening of March 28, 1963, Ricardo, Zosimo and Pio had supper and passed the night in Emang's house, while Liberato slept in a nearby house owned by a certain Peryang.

The appellants further narrated that at about three o'clock in the morning of March 29, 1963 Ricardo awakened his two companions as they had to catch the first passenger bus to Ubay. The owner of the house also woke up to prepare breakfast, but they did not wait for it as they wanted to take the first available bus. Ricardo, Zosimo and Pio proceeded to where Liberate was, and took a light breakfast which had already been prepared. The group then walked towards the main road with Ricardo, who was carrying a bag and holding a torch, leading the group. At about five o'clock, they boarded a bus bound for Ubay.

In the town of Buenavista, a uniformed Philippine Constabulary corporal, Marcelo Piquero (who, as a prosecution witness, corroborated the meeting with the appellants boarded the bus and sat beside Ricardo. At about nine o'clock in the morning, the bus stopped at Talibon, Bohol, for the passengers to take breakfast. The four took theirs with Cpl. Piquero; Ricardo paid the bill for all; and then they returned to their bus. This time Liberate and Zosimo sat beside Cpl. Piquero. Each of the appellants paid their own fare of P1.70 each. Ricardo also gave P5.00 to Pio who said he had no money and promised to sell Ricardo his four chickens. When the bus reached the barrio of Camambugan, Ubay, Bohol, Zosimo disembarked. After reaching his house, Zosimo applied straws on coconut trees, ate lunch, and took a nap. In the afternoon, he proceeded to the seashore to catch fish, where he was apprehended by P.C. soldiers and taken to the P.C. detachment headquarters in the poblacion of Ubay

Ricardo stepped down from the bus when it reached barrio Atsila, Ubay, Bohol. Arriving at his house, he gave the fish he bought during the trip to his children, delivered his bag to his daughter, and then repaired his plow. At about three o'clock, while Ricardo was taking a nap, Cpl. Piquero came to his house and told him that he (Piquero) was looking for somebody believed to be hiding in the barrio. Ricardo went later to Liberate's house to ask for spare parts for his plow and there met the chief of police of Calape, Panfilo C. Rodriguez, who informed him that a robbery had taken place that morning in Calunasan, Calape. Ricardo admitted having come from Calape early that morning, and together with Liberate went with the police chief to Ubay upon being informed that the latter was making a check on persons who came from Calape that day.

Liberato declared that at about three o'clock on March 29, 1963, he was walking past the house of a "cumpadre" in barrio Atsila when the latter inquired how much was the fish he was carrying. He went inside the house of his "cum-padre" and saw the chief of police of Calape and Cpl. Piquero. Liberato admitted he came from Calape on the first bus that morning together with Ricardo, Zosimo and Pio. The police chief asked Liberato to go with him to Ubay for identification purposes.

Pio was contacted by P.C. soldiers in his house and then taken to the P.C. detachment head-quarters in Ubay, Bohol.

The chief of police of Calape, Panfilo C. Rodriguez, testified that at about five o'clock in the morning of March 29, 1963, one of his men informed him of the robbery and homicide perpetrated in the house of the Orillosas. He forthwith repaired thereto with some of his men and conducted an investigation of the incident. Filomena Orillosa furnished him with a description of the culprits, and a neighbor told him that the robbers had proceeded northward from the place. Moments later, a bus inspector came and told him there were "four people that suited the descriptions given by Mrs. Orillosa who were bound for Ubay." The descriptions given by Filomena of the two men who entered her house were as follows: "a regular built man barely 30 years over, wearing blue jacket, blue shirt, dark pants, style hair-cut, fair complexion, and the other one, printed dark shirt with black maong pants.... The fellow who was with printed shirt was cross-eyed." On the basis of the bus inspector's information that the "four people" disembarked somewhere -in Camambugan, Ubay, Bohol, the police chief, together with his men and Gabriela Orillosa, went to Camambugan. At Ubay, Panfilo informed the P.C. detachment of the robbery and homicide that had been perpetrated in Calunasan, that morning. In the course of his search, the police chief also met Cpl. Piquero, and the latter told him that he (Piquero) "was with the persons which suited the

descriptions" he gave. In due time, as disclosed earlier, the appellants as well as Pio de la Peña were brought to Ubay, Bohol.

At the P.C. detachment headquarters, the four were told to enter a given room one at a time. Inside the room were Gabriela Orillosa and the chief of police of Calape, Bohol. While the four were being brought in one after another to her presence, Gabriela never spoke a word; however, after she had seen the four, Gabriela told the police chief and a P.C. sergeant that she could recognize only Zosimo Equipilag and was not sure of Liberato Bayotlang.

From Ubay, the four suspects were taken by P.C. soldiers to the municipal building of Calape where they arrived at about three o'clock in the morning of March 30, 1963. The chief of police of Calape, who rode in another vehicle, stopped by the house of Filomena who, together with her daughter Wenefreda and Leonides, went with the former to the municipal building of Calape to identify the suspects. As before, the appellants and Pio were told to enter the office of the chief of police, one after another, which was then lighted with a 100-watt bulb lamp. The three women likewise did not utter a word as the four suspects were presented to them one by one. As with Gabriela, it was only after they saw them all that the three women told the chief of police of Calape whom they recognized as the ones who robbed their house the evening before. Filomena and Wenefreda identified Zosimo Equipilag, who was cross-eyed, as the one who first entered the house and Liberato Bayotlang as the second intruder; Leonides said she recognized Liberato only.

On the witness stand, Gabriela explained that she did not identify Zosimo on the spot because she was afraid that his relatives might retaliate against her. Gabriela and her mother declared that they were able to recognize the two, Zosimo and Liberato, because of the combined illumination from the lighted lamp near the Sacred Heart's image in their living room and the flashlights of the two robbers, as their reflections criss-crossed in the living room.

Filomena, during her cross-testimony, stated that while she was at the office of the chief of police of Calape the latter asked her if she wanted to see the four persons whom he had arrested, and told her that the said four persons were the ones responsible for the robbery and homicide committed in her house.

The testimonies regarding the responsibility of the appellants for the crime charged were corroborated by Pio de la Peña who was excluded from the information and made a state witness. According to Pio, he met the appellants on March 28, 1963, while the latter were drinking beer inside a restaurant near the market in Calape, Bohol. Ricardo invited him to join the group in barrio Candungao, Calape, where they were staying because a girl there was then engaged to be married Pio and the other accused, except Liberato, passed the night in the house of the girl who was getting married. At about two o'clock in the morning of March 29, 1963, Pio and his two companions woke up pursuant to instructions given previously by Ricardo. Along the way, Ricardo told the group that they were going to rob a house. Ricardo told Pio that it was up to him (Pio) whether or not he would come along for the proposed venture. While the group was walking, Pio noticed for the first time that a gun, which Ricardo told him later was a .45 caliber firearm, was tucked in the waistline of Ricardo, and that Liberato had a .38 caliber revolver. Ricardo, however, did not tell them that there would be any killing during the robbery. Ricardo and Pio stood as guards and stayed on the grounds on both ends of the house. Pio allegedly did not know at that time that someone had been killed, although he heard several gun bursts and the voice of a woman crying for help. Pio further testified that after the gun bursts, Ricardo told those upstairs to go ahead and "skin them" off, while he urged them to hurry up. Ricardo then said that they had no more "peanuts" by which he meant "bullets." At about that moment, they heard the sound of an on-coming truck which caused Pio and Ricardo to scamper away and hide. Later, the two reached a schoolhouse where they defecated. Ricardo and Pio continued hiking until they reached the barrio of Mandaug, about a kilometer from Calunasan, where Ricardo previously told his companions they would meet. There, Pio saw Liberato and Zosimo. The four thereafter boarded a Bohol Land bus. When the bus stopped at a place called Mahawan, Ricardo and Liberato stepped out, but went back aboard

later. At the town of Buenavista where the bus stopped once more, Pio took a cup of coffee, Cpl. Piquero came aboard and, as pre-viously narrated, sat beside Ricardo.

After a thoroughgoing examination of the evidence adduced below, we are convinced that it is unlikely that the offended parties could not have figured out the exact identities of the persons who entered their house on that early morning of March 29, 1963. Although the lighted lamp near the image of the Sacred Heart in the Orillosa's living room did not, by itself, project enough light sufficient for the offended parties to identify the robbers - - a fact admitted by Filomena --the illumination from the lighted lamp was intermittently intensified by the light coming from the two flashlights of the robber-assailants who wielded them about the living room and other parts of the house while in search of valuables. The robbery in the case at bar was not done secretly and quickly but during a spread of time before wide-awake witnesses with whom the culprits conversed from time to time. The robbers even fired their guns a number of times. We are of the opinion that under the circumstances the inmates of the house of the deceased Isidoro Orillosa had sufficient available illumination and time to fix the identities of the persons who entered their house. The record in fact shows that Filomena was able to describe the outward appearance and the nature and color of the apparel of the two culprits. The descriptions she gave and the information volunteered by the Bohol Land bus inspector led to the arrest of the appellants.

3. The appellants argue, upon the third issue, that the identification made by Filomena and her daughter Gabriela was spurious because they did not immediately and on the spot identify Zosimo and Liberato as the ones who robbed their house when these two were presented to them for identification. That behaviour, according to the appellants' counsel, was unnatural, since the head of the family was killed during the alleged robbery and the identification of the suspects was required of them only a few hours after the crimes were perpetrated. Moreover, the chief of police of Calape uttered a statement to Filomena before she saw the appellants that suggested that the persons who had been arrested, that is, the appellants, were in fact the ones who committed the robbery and homicide in her house.

Gabriela satisfactorily explained why she did not, immediately and on the spot, identify Zosimo and Liberato as the culprits who entered their house: she was afraid that the relatives of these appellants might take revenge on her. In our opinion, that behaviour is not unnatural. When the appellants were presented for identification to Gabriela, Filomena, Wenefreda and Leonides, less than twenty-four hours had elapsed from the time the robbery and homicide in question were committed. The fact that the robbers were armed, had no qualms about shooting a helpless man, and, in seeming disregard of personal harm, audaciously fired their guns several times, are factors which must be considered in evaluating the terror and fear that gripped these witnesses and led them not to point to the culprits face to face. These witnesses are, moreover, women unaccustomed to gunfire and they had just witnessed the brutal slaying of the head and only male in the family. Under the circumstances, we are of the view that the behavioral theory advanced by the appellants' counsel cannot avail them any.

Moreover, it is not correct to say that Gabriela and Filomena did not immediately name Zosimo and Liberato as the culprits. The record shows that after the appellants, including Pio de la Peña, were presented to Gabriela in the afternoon of March 29, 1963, she forthwith informed the chief of police of Calape and a P.C. sergeant that she recognized Zosimo but was not sure of Liberato. The following morning, however, when the four suspects were presented to Filomena, Wenefreda and Leonides, the first two told the chief of police of Calape, right after they had seen the four, that they recognized Zosimo as the one who first entered their house and Liberato as the second intruder. Leonides could identify Liberato only.

The statement made by the chief of police of Calape to Filomena that the four were the ones who robbed her house is unfortunate and should not have been made at all. We are not persuaded, how-ever, that such statement had unduly influenced her. It is to be noted that there were four persons brought one after another before

Filomena, her daughter Wenefreda and cousin Leonides inside the office of the chief of police of Calape, and they were able to corroborate each other on the identity of Liberato, while Filomena and Wenefreda were both in agreement about Zosimo. The identification of Zosimo squared with the earlier declaration of Gabriela to whom the four were presented for identification in the afternoon of March 29, 1963. Not one of the other two, Ricardo and Pio, was pointed to by these witnesses as among those who committed the crime in question. Nevertheless, Ricardo's participation was amply established by the testimony of Pio de la Peña who, as earlier stated, was utilized as a state witness.

4. Finally, we do not consider the failure to administer paraffin tests on the appellants and the failure to recover the money and articles stolen from the Orillosas as sufficient to overcome the positive identification of the appellants by the wife, daughters and cousin of the deceased Isidoro Orillosa. These witnesses had not had any previous relationship or acquaintance with the appellants, excepting Ricardo who, according to Filomena, used to buy tobacco at her store prior to the incident in question. The said witnesses, therefore, had no evil motive or particular prejudice against Zosimo and Liberato when they pointed to them as the ones who committed the robbery and homicide in their dwelling. The record shows that early that same morning, after the perpetration of the crimes, Filomena was able to give the chief of police of Calape, who went to her house to investigate, a physical description of two of the culprits: their physical build, style of hair, wearing apparel, and that one was cross-eyed. The appellants do not deny that early that morning of March 29, 1963, they came from Masonoy, a barrio of Calape, Bohol, and walked along the way to the place where they could get transportation to go home; that there were four of them in the group; and that one, Zosimo, was cross-eyed. Cpl. Piquero, who sat beside Ricardo and then Zosimo and Liberato in the same bus that took the appellants to their residences in Ubay, Bohol and who ate breakfast with the latter at one of the bus stops, told the chief of police of Calape that the descriptions of the robbers which the police chief gave at the house of the Orillosas fitted those of the persons he rode with, that is, the appellants. Pio de la Peña, who turned state witness, confirmed that he and the appellants robbed the Orillosa house in the early morning of March 29, 1963.

We do not depreciate the value of paraffin tests and the recovery of the objects and instruments of a crime as aids to criminal investigation and analysis as well as to judicial appreciation of the probability of guilt; we are of the opinion, however, that their absence does not constitute a bar to a judgment of conviction where, on the basis of the evidence adduced, we are convinced, with moral certainty, that the accused are guilty. We find the indispensable elements of the offense of robbery with homicide proven beyond reasonable doubt.

The portion of the judgment awarding compensatory damages in the total amount of P7,267.00 to the heirs of the deceased should be modified. Compensatory damages for death resulting from crime have been increased to P12,000.00 (*People v. Pantoja*, No. L-18793, Oct. 11, 1968; 25 SCRA, 469-475 and other cases). The total amount stolen (cash and valuables) has been assessed at P1,500.00.

ACCORDINGLY, the judgment appealed from is hereby affirmed, with the sole modification that the civil liability of the appellants by way of compensatory damages to the heirs of the deceased Isidoro Orillosa is hereby increased to THIRTEEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED (P13,500.00) PESOS. Costs against the appellants.

Castro, C.J., Barredo, Makasiar, Antonio, Muñoz Palma, Aquino, Concepcion, Jr., Martin, Santos, Fernandez, and Guerrero, JJ., concur.

Fernando and Teehankee, JJ., no part.

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.