

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, – VERSUS – JAY PEDILLA OYOHROY, ACCUSED-APPELLANT.

Ponente: LAGURA-YAP, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/b063d7a396ee/>

LAGURA-YAP, J.:

Jay Pedilla Oyohoy (accused-appellant) appeals the Judgment[2] dated June 11, 2009 rendered by the Regional Trial Court, Branch 57, Cebu City in Criminal Case No. CBU-69371 and Criminal Case No. CBU-69372. In the former case, accused-appellant is convicted of Violation of Section 5, Article II of R.A. 9165 or the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act, while in the latter case the accused-appellant is convicted with Violation of Section 11, also under Article II of the Act.

The dispositive portion[3] of the decision reads:

Finding the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt, accused Jay Pedilla Oyohoy is sentenced to suffer the following penalties:

- life imprisonment and a fine of Php 500,000.00 for Violation of Section 5, Article II of R.A. 9165 and

- twelve (12) years and one (1) day to fifteen (15) years and a fine of Php300,000.00 for violation of Section 11, Article II of RA 9165.

The seventeen (17) packs of shabu (Exhs. “B” to “D”) are forfeited in favor of the government.

SO ORDERED.

The Information[4] filed on April 22, 2004, against accused Jay Pedilla Oyohoy under Criminal Case No. CBU-69371, alleges:

That on or about the 20[th] day of April, 2004, at about 2:30 P.M., in the City of Cebu, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the said accused, Jay Oyohoy y Pedilla, with deliberate intent, and without authority of law, did then and there sell, deliver or give away to a poseur buyer:

one transparent plastic pack of white crystalline substance weighing 0.03 gram

locally known as “SHABU” CONTAINING Methylamphetamine hydrochloride, (a) dangerous drug/s.

CONTRARY TO LAW.

The Information[5] also filed on even date against accused Jay Pedilla Oyohoy under Criminal Case No. CBU-69372, alleges:

That on or about the 20[th] day of April, 2004, at about 2:30 P.M., in the City of Cebu, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the said accused, Jay Oyohoy y Pedilla, with deliberate intent, did then and there have in his/her possession and under his/her possession and under his/her control the following:

*fourteen (14) transparent plastic pack (sic) of white crystalline substance containing (a) total weight of 0.42

grams;

two (2) transparent plastic pack of white crystalline substance weighing 1.30 grams

locally known as “SHABU” containing methamphetamine hydrochloride, a dangerous drug/s, without being authorized by law.

CONTRARY TO LAW.

The accused entered a “NOT GUILTY” plea during the arraignment[6] on May 19, 2004.

The evidence for the prosecution is summarized as follows:

On April 19, 2004, at about 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon, PO1 Uldarico Lamosao, received an information from a confidential agent that there was a person engaging in illegal drug activity in Barangay Tisa, Labangon, Cebu City. P/Sr. Inspector Lorenzo B. Trajano then instructed PO1 Lamosao to verify the information. On that date, PO1 Lamosao went to the area and he saw the accused engaging in illegal drug activity.

The following day, April 20, 2004, at about 10:00 o'clock in the morning, P/Sr. Inspector Lorenzo B. Trajano planned a buy-bust operation. He formed the buy-bust team composed of PO1 Lamosao, PO1 Miro, PO1 Dela Peña, PO1 Eborlas and PO3 Lumayag. PO1 Lamosao was designated as the poseur-buyer and was provided with a P100.00 bill with serial number R454353 and it was marked with the initials of “LBT”.

At about 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon of April 20, 2004, the buy-bust team proceeded to Brgy. Tisa, Cebu City, to conduct the buy-bust operation. Upon reaching the target area at around 2:30 P.M., PO1 Lamosao proceeded to the house of the accused while the other members of the team strategically positioned themselves in the vicinity. PO1 Lamosao together with the confidential agent met and negotiated with the accused. PO1 Lamosao received the shabu from the accused and the latter received the marked money from the former. After the transaction, PO1 Lamosao executed the pre-arranged signal by removing his bull cap.

When the buy-bust team saw the pre-arranged signal, they rushed to the scene where the poseur-buyer and the accused were. The accused was arrested and frisked. He was informed of his constitutional rights. As a result of the search, the team recovered from the accused's back pocket, the buy-bust money, fourteen (14) small plastic packs, two (2) medium plastic packs, all of which contained white crystalline substance. Thereafter, the accused was brought to the police station. The plastic pack, which was the subject of the buy-bust operation was marked as “BB”, while the fourteen (14) plastic packs and the two (2) plastic packs were marked as “JO-1 to JO-14 and JO-1 and JO-2”, respectively.

The evidence for the defense is summarized hereunder:

Accused Jay Oyohoy, 28 years old, single, jobless, is a resident of Basak, Pardo, Cebu City. He testified that on April 20, 2004, at around 2:30 in the afternoon, he was in the house of his Uncle Sevellejo at Labangon, Cebu City. The accused was feeding the chickens when three persons went inside the yard looking for “Raffy”. Policemen with armalite and firearms arrived. While his hands were placed at the back, a policeman inserted his hands inside his (accused) right pocket. The policeman then got from his (accused) pocket a plastic sachet of shabu. The accused said that he did not know where the sachet of shabu came from.

After the trial, the RTC promulgated[7] its judgment of conviction dated June 25, 2009 against the accused. Aggrieved, he filed a Notice of Appeal[8] dated June 29, 2009.

On July 15, 2009, the trial court issued an order (Mittimus) transferring the person of the accused-appellant to the New Bilibid Prison, Muntinlupa City.[9]

ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS

I

THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN CONVICTING THE ACCUSED-APPELLANT OF THE CRIME CHARGED DESPITE FAILURE OF THE PROSECUTION TO PROVE HIS GUILT BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT.

II

THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN NOT GIVING WEIGHT AND CREDENCE TO ACCUSED-APPELLANT'S DEFENSE OF DENIAL.

III

THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN RULING THAT THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY OF THE PACK OF SHABU WAS DULY ESTABLISHED, RETAINING ITS INTEGRITY AND EVIDENTIARY VALUE.

The accused-appellant Jay argues in his Brief that the testimonies of the two prosecution witnesses are doubtful. PO1 Dela Peña declared that the information that the accused was engaged in illegal drug trade was relayed by a concerned citizen through a telephone call, while PO1 Lamosao declared that it was their confidential informant who came to their office and relayed the information. PO1 Lamosao, the poseur buyer, declared that PO1 Miro was in possession of all the packs of white crystalline substance that were recovered from the accused-appellant, including the one sold in the buy-bust operation. However, Officer Miro declared that it was Officer Lamosao who was in possession of the item allegedly sold in the buy-bust operation from the scene up to the police station. Officer Lamosao turned it over only to Officer Miro at the police station. It is settled that when the testimonies of two key witnesses cannot stand together, the inevitable conclusion is that one or both must be telling a lie, and their story a mere concoction.[10]

According to the accused-appellant the records of the case would reveal that the alleged sale transpired in the alley where there are several houses and during broad daylight. At any rate, if indeed, petitioner was a peddler, he would know the perils inherent in his illegal trade and would not simply peddle prohibited drugs openly along a busy street. Carrying out an illicit business under these circumstances is contrary to common experience, given the clandestine nature of illegal drug dealings.

The accused-appellant says that there is doubt as to the existence of the buy-bust money. The buy-bust money was allegedly lost for an unjustifiable reason. The prosecution could not offer a justifiable explanation why the buy-bust money got lost. Therefore, the receipt of the buy-bust money remains unsubstantiated. While the presentation of the buy-bust money is not indispensable in the prosecution of a drug case, its non-presentation raises doubt on the occurrence of a buy-bust operation.

The accused-appellant contends that the prosecution failed to follow the chain of custody rule as provided for in R.A 9165. First, the shabu allegedly confiscated was not marked immediately upon seizure. Second, there were no photographs taken of the seized shabu. Third, there is no showing that a PDEA representative, members from the media and representative from the DOJ were present when the markings were made. Fourth, no inventory was made in the presence of the accused-appellant, his counsel and other persons required by law to be present. Fifth, the prosecution failed to identify the persons who handled the the shabu.

The accused-appellant says that his defense of frame-up remains unrebutted. The court a quo did not accord weight on this defense because of the pre-conceived notion that denial is weak. The court a quo lost sight of the settled rule that the evidence of the prosecution must stand or fall on its own weight and cannot be allowed to

draw strength from the weakness of the defense.

In a number of cases that the Supreme Court has decided, it acquitted the accused for failure of the arresting officers to faithfully follow the statutory requirements under Section 21 of R.A 9165. It stressed the importance of complying with the prescribed statutory procedure and that penal law should be construed strictly against the government, and liberally in favor of the accused.

The Solicitor General in his Brief counter argues that in the case of *People v. Darisan*,^[11] the Supreme Court held that in the prosecution for illegal sale of drugs, the following elements must first be established: 1. proof that the transaction took place; and 2. the presentation in court of the corpus delicti or the illicit drug as evidence. In a prosecution for illegal possession of a dangerous drug, it must be shown that 1. the accused was in possession of an item or an object identified to be a prohibited or regulated drug; 2. such possession is not authorized by law, and 3. the accused was freely and consciously aware of being in possession of the drug.

In the instant case, the prosecution was able to establish all of the above stated elements. PO1 Lamosao testified that after receiving the plastic pack of shabu from the accused and after he gave the marked money to the latter, PO1 Lamosao executed the pre-arranged signal. The police officers arrested the accused and was informed of his constitutional rights. PO1 Lamosao and PO1 Miro consistently testified that after the arrest, PO1 Miro frisked the accused and the former recovered from the latter's back pocket the buy-bust money, fourteen (14) small plastic packs, and another two (2) medium plastic packs all of which contained white crystalline substance. The substance inside the plastic packs were later on found to be positive for methylamphetamine hydrochloride.

The Solicitor General asseverates that the records are bereft of any evidence that would show that accused had the legal authority to possess the plastic packs containing methylamphetamine hydrochloride. It has been held in many jurisprudence that mere possession of a regulated drug per se constitutes prima facie evidence of knowledge or animus possidendi to convict an accused absent a satisfactory explanation of such possession.

The Solicitor General says that the accused-appellant's defense of frame up deserves scant consideration vis-a-vis the positive identification by PO1 Lamosao, PO1 Ricardo Dela Peña and PO1 Januario Miro. The police officers enjoy in their favor the presumption of regularity in the performance of their duties. Accused-appellant failed to adduce clear and convincing evidence to support his defense of frame-up. Other than the accused-appellant's bare allegations, there is no other evidence to support his defense. Bare denials, cannot prevail over the direct and positive testimony of the witness pointing to accused as perpetrator of the offense and cannot overcome the presumption that the police officer performed their duties regularly.^[12]

The Solicitor General explains that the inconsistencies pointed out by the accused-appellant are only minor in details. In *People vs. Fernando*,^[13] the Supreme Court said that discrepancies in minor matters do not impair the essential integrity of the prosecutor's evidence. What is important is that the testimonies agree on the essential facts and that the respective versions corroborate and substantially coincide with each others to make a consistent and coherent whole.

Finally, the Solicitor General asserts that the failure on the part of the police operatives to comply with the requirements set forth under paragraph 1, Section 21, Article II of R.A. 9165 is not fatal. The prosecution was able to preserve the integrity and evidentiary value of the said illegal drugs. The Supreme Court has held in several cases that non-compliance with Section 21, Article II of R.A. 9165 will not render an accused's arrest illegal or the items seized inadmissible.^[14] In the instant case, the integrity of the drugs seized from the accused-appellant was preserved. The chain of custody of the drugs was not broken. The prosecution was able to account for each and every link in the chain of custody over the shabu, from the moment it was retrieved from the buy-bust operation up to the time it was presented before the court as proof of the corpus delicti.

THE COURT'S RULING

The core issue in this case is whether or not clear and convincing evidence exists to support the conviction of the accused-appellant for violation of Sections 5 and 11, Article II of R.A. No. 9165.

The conviction of the accused-appellant stands.

It is the fundamental rule that factual findings of the trial courts involving credibility are accorded respect when no glaring errors, gross misapprehension of facts, and speculative, arbitrary, and unsupported conclusions can be gathered from such findings. The reason for this is that the trial court is in a better position to decide the credibility of the witnesses having heard their testimonies and observed their deportment and manner of testifying during the trial.[15]

We apply the above-quoted rule in this instant appeal.

In Criminal Case No. CBU-69371

In the case of *People of the Philippines v. Ryan Blanco y Sangkula*[16], the Supreme Court provides for the elements necessary for the successful prosecution of illegal sale of drugs: 1.) the identity of the buyer and the seller, the object and the consideration of the sale; 2.) the delivery of the thing sold and the payment therefore. What is material is the proof that the transaction actually took place, coupled with the presentation before the court of the prohibited or regulated drug or the corpus delicti. To sustain a conviction under this provision, the prosecution therefore needs to establish the identity of the buyer, seller, object and consideration, and the delivery of the thing sold.

In the case at bar, PO1 Uldarico Lamosao (poseur-buyer) testified that when he arrived at the target area together with their confidential asset, the latter introduced PO1 Lamosao to the accused-appellant (later on identified as Jay Oyohoy). Thereafter, PO1 Lamosao asked the accused-appellant “Bay, do you have stock? We will buy one pack of shabu”. [17] The accused-appellant immediately gave the packet of shabu to the poseur-buyer and in turn the latter gave the Php 100.00 buy-bust money. [18] After the exchange of the plastic packet of shabu and the buy-bust money, the poseur-buyer executed the pre-arranged signal by removing his bull cap as a sign that the transaction has been consummated. [19]

PO1 Miro and PO1 Dela Peña corroborated the testimony of PO1 Lamosao. Both witnesses said that they (buy-bust team) boarded their service vehicle. When they arrived in Tisa, Cebu City, they stopped at the designated area. PO1 Lamosao together with the confidential agent, boarded a tricycle and proceeded to the target area. [20] The rest of the buy-bust team followed and positioned themselves strategically. [21] PO1 Miro and PO1 Dela Peña testified that they were positioned in a store in front of the accused-appellant and the poseur-buyer. [22] They said that the accused-appellant was facing in front of them (PO1 Miro and PO1 Dela Peña). Although the backs of the poseur-buyer and the confidential informant were facing them, PO1 Miro and PO1 Dela Peña can still see the transaction because the movements between the poseur-buyer and the accused-appellant enabled them to clearly see the transaction. [23] In that distance and location PO1 Miro and PO1 Dela Peña saw that the accused-appellant hand something to PO1 Lamosao while the accused-appellant also handed something to the poseur-buyer. [24] PO1 Miro and PO1 Dela Peña aver that when they saw PO1 Lamosao remove the bull cap from his head, they rushed towards the accused-appellant and was able to arrest the latter. [25] When the accused-appellant was arrested, he was apprised of his constitutional rights and his arrest. PO1 Miro was able to get from the accused-appellant fourteen (14) small packs of suspected shabu, and two (2) medium packs of shabu [26].

PO1 Miro and Dela Peña were more or less ten meters from the accused-appellant, the poseur-buyer and the

confidential agent. The buy-bust operation happened in an open space and broad daylight. These circumstances are sufficient for Us to conclude that PO1 Miro and Dela Peña witnessed the exchange of the buy-bust money and the packet of shabu between PO1 Lamosao and the accused-appellant. The testimonies of PO1 Lamosao (poseur-buyer), PO1 Miro and PO1 Dela Peña have established with moral certainty the elements of illegal sale of dangerous drugs. Settled is the rule that as long as the police officer went through the operation as a buyer and his offer was accepted by appellant and the dangerous drug delivered to the former, the crime is considered consummated by the delivery of the goods.[27]

The accused-appellant was immediately brought to the Talisay City Police Station for proper documentation. PO1 Miro marked the sachet of shabu[28] sold by the accused-appellant, weighing 0.03 grams, with letter “BB” which stands for buy-bust.[29] PO1 Miro prepared the Letter[30] Request for Laboratory Examination and brought the letter request to the PNP Crime Laboratory together with the confiscated packets of shabu.[31] Per Chemistry Report No. D-705-2004[32] conducted by Police Senior Inspector Medardo Hingpit Palapo, who also testified in court, the specimen submitted for examination gave a positive result to Methamphetamine Hydrochloride, a dangerous drug.[33] Police Officer Lamosao identified plastic packet of shabu sold by the accused-appellant, as the one that he (PO1 Lamosao) bought during the buy-bust operation.

We are convinced that this sachet of shabu was that which was sold by the accused-appellant to the poseur buyer. The police had marked it before bringing it to the crime laboratory. Consequently, this sachet of shabu was examined by the forensic chemist and presented in court as evidence to prove the existence and identity of the shabu sold during the buy-bust operation. The sequence of events would show that the chain of custody has been established. In the case before Us, there was clearly no gap or missing link in the chain of custody. The integrity and the evidentiary value of the confiscated items were properly preserved by the prosecution. These circumstances when considered are adequate to prove corpus delicti of the crime of sale and delivery of dangerous drug.

The dangerous drug itself, the shabu, constitutes the very corpus delicti of the offense and in sustaining a conviction, the identity and integrity of the corpus delicti must definitely be shown to have been preserved. This requirement necessarily arises from the illegal drug's unique characteristic that renders it indistinct, not readily identifiable, and easily open to tampering, alteration or substitution either by accident or otherwise. Thus, to remove any doubt or uncertainty on the identity and integrity of the seized drug, evidence must definitely show that the illegal drug presented in court is the same illegal drug actually recovered from the accused-appellant.[34]

In Criminal Case No. CBU-69372

In a prosecution for illegal possession of dangerous drugs, the following elements must concur: (1) the accused is in possession of an item or object which is identified to be a prohibited drug; (2) such possession is not authorized by law; (3) the accused freely and consciously possesses the said drug.[35]

This Court is convinced that the accused-appellant is likewise guilty of violation of Section 12, Article II of R.A 9165 or Possession of Dangerous Drugs. PO1 Miro testified, as corroborated by Police Officers Dela Peña and Lamosao, that during the search he recovered from the possession of the accused-appellant, fourteen (14) small plastic packets of shabu all weighing 0.42 grams and two (2) medium sized plastic packets of shabu both weighing 1.30 grams.[36] These items were identified in court by PO1 Miro as the ones he confiscated from the accused-appellant after his arrest.[37]

The sixteen (16) plastic sachets of shabu confiscated from the possession of the accused-appellant were submitted to the PNP Crime Laboratory by PO1 Miro. Per testimony of the forensic chemist, Police Senior Inspector

Medardo Hingpit Palapo, the sixteen (16) plastic sachets of shabu yielded positive to Methamphetamine Hydrochloride or shabu.[38]

We adhere to the rule in *People of the Philippines v. Linda Alviz, et. al.*, [39] where the Supreme Court said that as a result of the finding that a buy-bust operation actually took place and that the accused was apprehended in flagrante delicto, the evidence gathered and presented by the prosecution on the occasion of their lawful arrest without warrant cannot be deemed as the “fruits of a poisonous tree,” but are admissible and competent proof of their guilt.

The accused-appellant offers mere denial as his defense. He claims that he was feeding the chickens at his uncle's house at the time of the arrest and that the alleged buy-bust operation was fictitious. However, other than his own self-serving testimony, accused-appellant has not offered any evidence to support this claim.

It is worth mentioning that the accused-appellant testified that the police officers were armed with armalite and guns.[40] He further said that there are many houses and people living near the house of his uncle.[41] Nevertheless, the accused did not present any witness in court to corroborate his claim of frame up. To our mind, it would be impossible for the accused-appellant to say that nobody has witnessed the incident of his arrest. The presence of the police officers with armalites and guns would have ignited suspicion and curiosity, much less, chaos among his neighbors. These statements reflect the lack of credence in the defense of the accused-appellant. The accused-appellant could have presented his uncle in court to attest to the truth of his alibi that his uncle has a neighbor named “raffy”. It is noticeable that no case was filed against the police officers who entered the premises of his uncle allegedly without authority. No complaint was also filed against the police officers for the alleged illegal arrest. The accused-appellant could have pursued these remedies to belie the accusations against him, but he chose not to.

We have held that “[a] bare denial is an inherently weak defense x x x.” Appellant’s denial is unsubstantiated by any credible and convincing evidence. Between the positive and categorical testimonies of the arresting officers on one hand, and the unsubstantiated denial of the appellant on the other, we are inclined to uphold the former.[42]

WHEREFORE, the Judgment dated June 11, 2009 rendered by the Regional Trial Court (RTC) Branch 57, Cebu City in Criminal Case No. CBU-69371 and Criminal Case No. CBU-69372, convicting accused-appellant Jay Oyohoy of Violations of Section 5 and Section 11 respectively, of Article II of R.A 9165 as amended or the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act is hereby AFFIRMED.

With costs against the accused-appellant.

SO ORDERED.

Delos Santos, and Azcarraga-Jacob,[*] JJ., concur.

[1] As per Affidavit executed by the half sister and aunt of the accused-appellant and the Death Certificate of the latter's mother, the spelling of accused-appellant's surname is “HOYOHYOY”. However, in the records of this case the spelling of the surname of the accused-appellant is “Oyohoy”.

[*] Per Office Order No. 18-14-GTI dated July 7, 2014.

[2] Records, p. 147-155.

[3] Records, p. 145-146.

- [4] Records, p. 1.
- [5] Records, p. 8.
- [6] Records, p. 15, “Certificate of Arraignment”.
- [7] Records p. 140.
- [8] Records p. 150.
- [9] Records, pp. 153-154.
- [10] People vs. Lim, August 7, 2002, G.R. No. 141699.

[11] 577 SCRA 486 (2009).

- [12] People vs. Encila, 578 SCRA 341 (2009).
- [13] G.R. No. 170836, April 4, 2007.
- [14] People vs. Lazaro, G.R. No. 186418, October 16, 2009.
- [15] People of the Philippines v. Linda Alviz y Yatco and Elizabeth Dela Vega, G.R. No. 177158, February 6, 2013.
- [16] G.R. No. 193661, August 14, 2013; Supra note 12.
- [17] TSN. July 20, 2006, p. 8.
- [18] TSN. July 20, 2006, p. 9.
- [19] Ibid.
- [20] TSN, May 30, 2007, p. 7.
- [21] TSN, May 30, 2007, p. 8.
- [22] TSN, February 23, 2005, p. 13, testimony of PO1 Dela Peña; TSN, May 30, 2007, pp. 28-30, testimony of PO1 Miro.
- [23] TSN, May 30, 2007, p. 31.
- [24] TSN, June 9, 2005, p. 15.
- [25] TSN, May 30, 2007, pp. 10-11, testimony of PO1 Miro; February 23, 2005, pp. 14-15. testimony of PO1 Dela Peña.
- [26] TSN, February 23, 2005, p. 15, testimony of PO1 Dela Peña; TSN, May 30, 2007, p. 11.
- [27] People of the Philippines v. Marianito Gonzaga y Jomaya, G.R. No. 184952, October 11, 2010.
- [28] TSN, July 20, 2006, pp. 11-12; TSN, May 30, 2007, p. 13; Exhibit “C”, Records, p. 108.
- [29] TSN, June 9, 2005, p. 24.
- [30] Exhibit “A”, Formal Offer of Exhibits, Records, p. 108.
- [31] TSN, May 30, 2007, pp. 14-17.

[32] Exhibit “E”, Formal Offer of Exhibits, Records, p. 109.

[33] TSN, August 19, 2004, pp. 4-5.

[34] People of the Philippines, vs. Alberto Bacus Alcuizar, G.R. No. 189980, April 06, 2011 citing People v. Denoman, G.R. No. 171732, 15 August 2009, 596 SCRA 257, 267 citing People v. Robles, G.R. No. 177220, 24 April 2009, 586 SCRA 647, 655-656.

[35] Benedicto Marquez y Rayos Del Sol v. People of the Philippines, G.R. No. 197207, March 13, 2013.

[36] Supra note 31.

[37] TSN, June 9, 2005, pp. 17-18; TSN, June 9, 2005, pp. 20-23.

[38] TSN, August 19, 2004, pp.4-5.

[39] Supra note 12.

[40] TSN, November 26, 2008, p. 7.

[41] TSN, January 21, 2009, p. 10.

[42] People of the Philippines vs. Calesto Duque Fun Dales, Jr., G.R. No. 184606, September 05, 2012 citing the case of People v. Quigod, G.R. No. 186419, April 23, 2010, 619 SCRA 407, 424.

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.