

THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. MANUEL PILONES Y. YBAÑEZ, DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.

G.R. Nos. L-32754-5. July 21, 1978

Ponente: AQUINO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/c4a733d8ce82/>

AQUINO, J.:

Manuel Pilonés appealed from the decision of the Circuit Criminal Court of Manila in Criminal Cases Nos. CCC-VI-170 (70) and CCC-VI-171(70), convicting him of murder and frustrated murder, and sentencing him in the murder case to life imprisonment and to indemnify the heirs of Antonio G. Renolia in the sum of P18,000.

In the frustrated murder case, he was sentenced to an indeterminate penalty ranging from six years and one day of prison mayor, as minimum, to twelve years and one day of reclusion temporal, as maximum, for having assaulted Nicanor Ilagan. No indemnity was imposed.

In the evening of April 9, 1970 a wake or vigil for the dead (lamayan) was held in a house near Jossie Bakery, located at J.(F.) Posadas Street, Punta, Sta. Ana, Manila. Among the many persons present at that vigil were Nicanor Ilagan, 19, single, jobless, a student, and Antonio G. Renolia (Renolla), nicknamed Tony, 22, married, a jeepney driver, respectively residing at 2572 F. Posadas Street and 2495 Bagong Sikat Street, both located at Punta, Sta. Ana, Manila.

Shortly after midnight or in the early morning of April 10, 1970, the house, where the vigil was being held, was stoned. Ilagan and the others came out of the house and went to the street to find out who had hurled the stones. As Ilagan stood on the lighted street, he was shot in the knee (Exh. E). He fell on the ground. The assailant was at a distance of around six meters from Ilagan and about fifteen meters away from the electric lamp on the street. Ilagan saw his assailant's face. Because of the light of the electric lamp, Ilagan remembered his assailant as the same person whom he had seen a week before in that vicinity, challenging persons to a fight.

When Ilagan fell, Tony, who had also come out of the house, went to his assistance and tried to lift him. While in a stooping position, Tony was shot by the same assailant. The bullet entered his "upper left anterior chest" over the second rib and "coursed downward and backward, lacerating his left pulmonary artery and his right lung" (Exh. D).

The assailant and his companions, Danny Banlag, Milo and others, who were armed with arrows and carried stones, ran away.

Tony or Antonio G. Renolia died on the way to the hospital. Ilagan was also brought to the hospital where he was treated for two weeks.

For sometime, the police made no progress in the investigation of the crime. On the third day after the shooting, Ilagan, while in the hospital, was informed by his friends, one of whom was Aida, that his assailant was Manuel Pilonés.

Fifty days after the shooting, or on May 30, 1970, Manuel Pilones, 20, jobless, a resident of 148 Tenement Housing Project, Punta, Sta. Ana, Manila, was arrested for vagrancy by patrolmen of Precinct No. 9. Ilagan, who was fetched from his residence by Tony's mother, identified Pilones as the person who had shot him after midnight on April 10, 1970. At that confrontation, Pilones was just one arm's length from Ilagan.

When Ilagan fingered Pilones as the malefactor, who had shot him and Tony Renolia (Question No. 19 of Exh. F), Pilones did not say anything (18 tsn July 13, 1970). Emiliana Giray Renolia, the mother of Tony, a resident of 2225 F. Posadas Street, Punta, Sta. Ana, was also at the precinct. She likewise identified Pilones as the assailant of her deceased son and three other persons (Crime Report, Exh. G). Pilones refused to give any statement or comment at that investigation. The investigator's testimony on this point upon interrogation by the fiscal is as follows (2 tsn July 30, 1970):

"Q. In Exhibit F (Ilagan's statement), the witness Nicanor Ilagan pointed to Manuel Pilones in answer to Question No. 19, where was accused Pilones when pointed to by witness Nicanor Ilagan? - A. He was present in the investigation room, sir.

"Q. How far was he from Nicanor Ilagan when pointed to by him? - A. He was near the table, sir.

"Q. Do you know whether the accused heard Nicanor Ilagan when pointed to as the one responsible for the shooting of the victim? - A. Yes, sir.

"Q. What did he say? - A. Nothing, sir.

"Q. Did you investigate accused Pilones? - A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Did you confront him with this case? - A. Yes, sir.

"Q. What did he say? - A. He said nothing.

"Q. Did you take his statement? - A. No, sir.

"Q. Why? - A. He is (was) not willing to give his statement.

"Q. Why was he not willing to give his statement? A. I do not know, sir.

"Q. Did you explain the reason why? - A. Yes, sir, but he refused to give his statement."

At the trial, Pilonos relied on an alibi. He testified that when the shooting occurred, he was in the house of his aunt, Marilou Campbell, at Olongapo City. He was in that place from December 31, 1969 to May 28, 1970. His aunt and his brother-in-law, who was allegedly his companion in going to Olongapo City, did not take the witness stand to corroborate his alibi.

Anacoreta Castro, a widow and a neighbor of Pilonos at Punta, Sta. Ana, corroborated his alibi. However, her testimony is weakened by a serious contradiction. She testified that Pilonos, who was like a child to her because his family and her family "are practically one", left for Olongapo City before Christmas, while, on the other hand, Pilonos testified that he went to that place after Christmas or on December 31, 1969 (6 and 14 tsn July 30, 1970).

The personal circumstances of Pilonos may be useful in assessing his character. He has a common-law wife. He has tattoo marks on his body placed by Ben Lumot. He claims that he was framed up by Patrolman Bayani Lasian, who resided at the sixth floor of the tenement house, where he (Pilonos) also resided. Patrolman Lasian allegedly suspected Pilonos of being implicated in the killing of Patrolman Gameng. Lasian allegedly had a grudge against Pilonos because during a basketball tournament among residents of the tenement house Pilonos "tripped" and Lasian boxed him (7 tsn July 30, 1970; See Exh. 1). The residence of Pilonos is about 12 meters away from Posadas Street.

The crucial factual issue is whether Pilonos was sufficiently identified by the prosecution's sole eyewitness, Ilagan, as the assailant of Ilagan and the deceased Tony Renolia.

The doctor, who treated Ilagan, testified that when he operated on Ilagan's wounded knee, he extracted therefrom metallic fragments. On the other hand, the doctor, who conducted an autopsy on the cadaver of Renolia, testified that he extracted a .22 caliber slug from the victim's body. Since there is a difference between a slug and a metallic fragment, Pilonos' counsel contends that Ilagan and Renolia were shot by different persons or with different weapons.

That circumstance is not sufficient to cast a reasonable doubt on appellant's guilt. It merely conveys the impression that, inasmuch as according to Ilagan, he and Renolia were shot in succession, Pilonos used different weapons. He had time to change weapons. He had companions who could have assisted him in the execution of his felonious acts.

The fact is that Ilagan positively identified Pilonos as the person who shot him (Ilagan). Even if Renolia was shot by Pilonos' companion, with a firearm different from the .22 caliber rifle used against Ilagan, Pilonos would still be criminally liable for Renolia's death because he, obviously, conspired with the person who shot Renolia. Pilonos and his companions were together at the scene of the crime. They left the place together. They had community of design.

The decisive fact is that Pilonos was not only identified by Ilagan but at the confrontation in the police precinct between accuser and accused, Pilonos, as the accused, just kept silent and did not deny Ilagan's accusation and the identification made by Renolia's mother. "He who remains silent when he ought to speak cannot be heard to speak when he should be silent" (31 C.J.S. 494). Rule 130 of the Rules of Court provides:

"SEC. 23. Admission by silence. - Any act or declaration made in the presence and within the observation of a party who does or says nothing when the act or declaration is such as naturally to call for action or comment if not true, may be given in evidence against him."

"Silence is assent as well as consent, and may, where a direct and specific accusation of crime is made, be regarded under some circumstances as a quasi-confession. An innocent person will at once naturally and

emphatically repel an accusation of crime, as a matter of self-preservation and self-defense, and as a precaution against prejudicing himself. A person's silence, therefore, particularly when it is persistent, will justify an inference that he is not innocent."(Underhill's Criminal Evidence, 4th Ed. p. 401).

Appellant Pilonos contends that the trial court erred in not granting his motion for new trial based on newly discovered evidence, which is the affidavit of Arturo Pangan, a detainee in the city jail of Manila. Pangan declared in his affidavit that in the "riot", clash or encounter (salakay o sagupaan) on April 9, 1970 between the residents of Barrio Puso and the residents of Labasan Bukid, he and Romy Pilonos, a brother of Manuel Pilonos, were together and he saw that Antonio Renolia and Nicanor Ilagan were shot by Aquilino Pingol with a .22 caliber rifle; that Pingol was in the company of Danny and Nilo Garcia, alias Nilong Bulag, and that at that time Manuel Pilonos was in Olongapo City.

It is evident from Pangan's affidavit that he was referring to another incident. Pangan was referring to a riot or rumble between two groups of persons. Ilagan did not testify to any rumble or tumultuous affray between the residents of two places. He testified simply to a shooting at F. Posadas Street, Punta, Sta. Ana when he came out of the house where a vigil for the dead was being held.

Moreover, if according to Pangan, Romy Pilonos, the brother of appellant Manuel Pilonos, was with Pangan on that occasion, the alleged newly discovered evidence could have been presented by the appellant during his trial. His brother, Romy, could not have been ignorant of what Arturo Pangan knew and Romy could have informed Manuel Pilonos earlier that the assailant of Ilagan and Renolia was Pingol.

The trial court did not err in denying the motion for new trial.

We are convinced that Pilonos was sufficiently identified by Ilagan as the person who shot him and Renolia. Pilonos has not shown any reason as to why Ilagan would accuse him of murder and frustrated murder. There is no showing that Ilagan had connived with Patrolman Lasian, whom Pilonos believes is the one responsible for his arrest, to frame up the accused.

No motive was established as to why Pilonos shot Ilagan and Renolia. The shooting can be characterized as purely a mischievous act of deviltry committed by a jobless and lawless person who did not know of any better way of using his time.

The trial court erred in holding that the crime as to Ilagan is frustrated murder. The wound in his knee was not sufficient to cause his death. The crime is only attempted murder. The accused did not perform all the acts of execution that would bring about the death of Ilagan.

WHEREFORE, the lower court's judgment is affirmed with the modification that in Criminal Case No. 171(70), Pilonos is convicted of attempted murder and is sentenced to an indeterminate penalty of three (3) years of prision correccional medium, as minimum, to six (6) years and one (1) day of prision mayor minimum, as maximum, and to pay an indemnity to Nicanor Ilagan in the sum of two thousand pesos.

The term "life imprisonment" used by the trial court should be changed to reclusion perpetua. It is the latter term that carries with it the imposition of the accessory penalties (People vs. Mobe, 81 Phil. 58; Art. 73, Revised Penal Code). Costs against the appellant.

SO ORDERED.

Fernando, (Chairman), Barredo, Concepcion, Jr., and Santos, JJ., concur.

Antonio, J., 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.