

EVANGELISTO RACELA, PETITIONER, VS. THE HON. AGUSTIN C. BAGASAO, PRESIDING JUDGE, BRANCH VI, FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT, COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NUEVA ECIJA, AND ROLANDO FELICI...*G.R. No. L-46938. June 14, 1979*

Ponente: CONCEPCION JR., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/c7cf0974c15c/>**CONCEPCION JR., J.:**

Petition for certiorari to annul and set aside the order of the respondent judge denying the motion to dismiss a criminal case for Libel, as well as the orders denying the motions for its reconsideration.

The March 20, 1976 issue of the Bulletin Today, a news-paper of general circulation throughout the Philippines, carried a news item entitled: "Olongapo stinks as trash piles up," im-puting certain anomalies and violations of the contract for the collection of garbage in Olongapo City. Feeling aggrieved, the contractor, Rolando Feliciano, a resident of Malayantoc, Sto. Domingo, Nueva Ecija, filed a complaint for Libel against Evangelisto Racela, a duly elected barangay captain and member of the City Sangguniang Bayan of Olongapo, and Roberto Flores, also a member of the Sangguniang Panglunsod of Olongapo City, with the Provincial Fiscal of Nueva Ecija. Since the accused are public officers, the Provincial Fiscal sought clearance and authority from the Secretary of Justice to conduct a preliminary investigation of the case,[1] but, the request was denied for the reason that the libelous imputations partake of the nature of absolutely privileged communication within the purview of the second paragraph of Art. 354 of the Revised Penal Code since the statements were made during the special session of the City Sangguniang Bayan.[2]

Upon learning of such denial, Rolando Feliciano withdrew his complaint from the Fiscal's Office and filed the same directly with the Court of First Instance of Nueva Ecija.[3] The respondent judge, to whom the case was assigned, there-after set the case for preliminary examination and investigation. The accused Evangelisto Racela objected and filed a motion to dismiss the case for the reason that a criminal complaint had been filed with the Fiscal's Office and the same is still pending therein,[4] but, the respondent court denied the motion for lack of merit.[5] Citing the case of *People vs. Hechanova*,[6] the accused Racela filed a motion for the reconsideration of this order upon the ground that the respondent court has no jurisdiction to conduct a preliminary investigation of the case since a preliminary investigation had already been conducted by the Fiscal and the case was dismissed by the Secretary of Justice.[7] The respondent court, however, denied the motion, maintaining that it has the power and authority to conduct a preliminary examination and investigation of a case directly filed with it pursuant to Sec. 13, Rule 112 of the Re-vised Rules of Court, and that the case of *People vs. Hechanova*, cited by the accused is not applicable since the Fiscal in the present case, as contradistinguished from the cited case, has not yet conducted a preliminary investigation of the case, but merely made an ex-parte study of the affidavits of the complainant and his witnesses.[8] Hence, the present petition.

Simplified, the issue is whether or not a judge of first instance may conduct a preliminary investigation of a libel

case directly filed with the court. In a recent decision, in the case of *Escribano vs. Avila*,^[9] the Court categorically ruled that judges of first instance are vested with authority to conduct a preliminary investigation of a case for libel directly filed with the court since "the lawmaking body, by means of the amendment,^[10] never intended to take away the jurisdiction of the proper Court of First Instance to conduct a preliminary investigation in libel cases," and that the "amendment merely sought to strip the ordinary municipal court (not the municipal court of the provincial capital or the city court) of its power to hold a preliminary investigation of written defamations." Hence, the instant petition is without merit.

WHEREFORE, the petition should be, as it is hereby, **DISMISSED**. Costs against the petitioner.

SO ORDERED.

Antonio, (Acting Chairman), Aquino, Santos, and Abad Santos, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, p. 55.

[2] *Id.*, p. 56.

[3] *Id.*, p. 67.

[4] *Id.*, p. 29.

[5] *Id.*, p. 34.

[6] G.R. No. L-25459, Nov. 29, 1973, 54 SCRA 101.

[7] Rollo, p. 35.

[8] *Id.*, pp. 44, 51.

[9] G.R. No. L-30375, September 12, 1978.

[10] Republic Act No. 4363, approved June 19, 1965.

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.