

**PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. DOMINGO EUSTAQUIO, IGLECERIA EUSTAQUIO, JEAN EUSTAQUIO ALIAS NONOY, AND NONONG RUADO, ACCUSED-APPELLANTS.**

*G.R. No. 104398. March 01, 1994*

Ponente: PUNO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-104398/>

---

**PUNO, J.:**

This is an appeal by Domingo Eustaquio and Jean Eustaquio alias "Nonoy" from the Decision, dated January 13, 1992, of the RTC, Fifth Judicial Region, Br. 44, Masbate, Masbate[1] in Crim. Case No. 6108 where they were convicted for the Murder of Antonio Dante.

It appears that accused-appellants Domingo and Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio, as well as Igleceria Eustaquio and Nonong Ruado were charged with Murder in an Information, dated August 21, 1990, which reads:

"The undersigned 2nd Asst. Provincial Prosecutor accuses Domingo Eustaquio, Igleceria Eustaquio, Nonoy Eustaquio and Nonong Ruado of San Francisco, Calumpang, Milagros, Masbate of the crime of Murder, committed as follows:

That on or about May 3, 1990, in the morning thereof, at Sitio San Francisco, Barangay Calumpang, Municipality of Milagros, Province of Masbate, Philippines, within the jurisdiction of this court, the above-named accused, confederating together and helping one another, with intent to kill, evident premeditation, treachery and superiority of strength, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously attack, assault, stab with a bolo and strike with an iron bar and piece of bamboo one Antonio Dante, hitting him on the different parts of the body, thereby inflicting wounds, which directly caused his instantaneous death.

"CONTRARY TO LAW."

The accused are related to each other. Domingo Eustaquio and Igleceria Eustaquio are husband and wife. Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio is their son. Nonong Ruado is the nephew of Igleceria. Except for Ruado, who remained at large, they all pleaded not guilty to the charge.

To prove the Information of murder against accused-appellants, the prosecution presented two witnesses, namely: ELMA FUENTES, the daughter of the deceased Antonio Dante from his first marriage and AURELIA DANTE, Antonio's second wife.

According to their testimonies, on May 2, 1990, they, together with the deceased Antonio, went to Sitio San Francisco, to attend its fiesta celebration. The dance held that evening lasted until dawn and they spent the night in the sitio.[2] At 10:00 a.m., the following day, they started their trek home to Cabuyogan, San Pablo, Mandaon, Masbate. When they reached the trail in front of the residence of Domingo and Igleceria Eustaquio, Domingo called Antonio and invited him to come over to their house. Antonio heeded the call and approached Domingo. Elma and Aurelia, however, continued walking down the trail until they reached a shaded area where they stopped to wait for Antonio.[3]

From their place, Elma and Aurelia saw Domingo meet the deceased outside the Eustaquio residence. Suddenly, Domingo brought out a bolo and hacked Antonio on the right side of his body, and then on the back of his neck.[4] The other accused, Igleceria and Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio, and Nonong Ruado simultaneously attacked Antonio, hitting him on different parts of the body with their respective weapons. Jean (alias Nonoy) was armed with an iron bar while Igleceria and Nonong wielded pieces of bamboo measuring about one meter in length.[5] Elma and Aurelia were shocked by the sudden and brutal assault on Antonio, they were unable to shout for help.[6] They tried to approach the fallen Antonio. They stopped because of the threats made by Domingo.[7]

Unable to recover Antonio's body, Elma and Aurelia walked for one hour to Cabuyogan to the house of Aurelia's brother, Ernesto Condenato. Unfortunately, they failed to find Ernesto.[8] They then rushed to the residence of the deceased's brother, Egmedio Dante in Taisan.[9]

With Egmedio Dante and his son, Charley, the two returned to the scene of the crime to recover Antonio's body.[10] At that time, accused-appellants had gone away. The deceased was brought to Egmedio's house in Taisan and the killing was reported to the police.[11] Dr. Aguilar conducted the post-mortem examination on Antonio's body.[12] His report (Exh. "A") states:

"Physical Findings:

1. Rigor mortis at lower extremity. Rest of the body flaccid.
2. Hematoma, 1/2 x 1/2 inches, at the right temporal region.
3. Lacerated wound, eyebrow, right.
4. Ecchymosis, upper and lower eyelids, bilateral.
5. Hematomas, circular, (2), located at the left temporal region.
6. Lacerated wound, about two inches long, located at right deltoid region, with fracture of the underlying bone, and fracture extending to the lower occipital bone, accompanied by contusion of the cerebellum.
7. Stab wound, about one inch in diameter, located just below the xyphoid bone of the sternum, and penetrating, puncturing the diaphragm.
8. Stab wound, about two inches in diameter, at the middle of the upper abdominal quadrant, right, just below the last coastal area, penetrating and going through the lobe of the liver.
9. Hematomas, at the posterior aspects of both legs.

"Cause of Death: SHOCK DUE TO BRAIN INJURY AND EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL HEMORRHAGE DUE TO STAB WOUNDS, ABDOMEN."

The version of accused-appellants is entirely different. Their story is that Antonio was killed only by Domingo Eustaquio in defense of his wife, Igleceria. They likewise alleged that Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio was not in sitio San Francisco at the time of the incident. This line of defense was the subject of testimonies by DOMINGO and IGLECERIA EUSTAQUIO and their daughter, JEANITA EUSTAQUIO.

According to the defense, Antonio called in on the Eustaquios at around seven o'clock in the morning of May 3, 1990. Domingo, Igleceria and Jeanita Eustaquio were then eating their breakfast in their house. Upon the Eustaquios' invitation, the victim joined them for their morning meal.[13] After breakfast, Antonio asked Igleceria -- who was the sitio treasurer -- if he could borrow some money, so he could follow his wife to Manila. Igleceria rejected the request. She explained she did not have any money as she had already turned over the proceeds of the dance to the fiesta committee president.[14] Antonio left immediately, and Domingo and Jeanita went to

sleep.[15]

At around ten o'clock of the same morning, while accused Igleceria was in the kitchen of their house preparing lunch, Antonio came back. He was tipsy and smelled of liquor. Antonio reiterated his request for money, which Igleceria again turned down. Antonio then grabbed Igleceria's collar and the side of her dress, and told her in a low voice he was going to rape her. He did not, however, make any lascivious act that would indicate he was going to act on his threat. The collar and the side of the dress of Igleceria were torn when she tried to free herself from Antonio's grasp. Even then, she did not scream for help.[16]

The commotion awakened Jeanita. She opened the window that separated her room from the kitchen, and saw her mother in a kneeling position, trying to break free from Antonio who was holding on to her dress. Jeanita immediately went to her father and woke him up. They "casually" went down the stairs towards the kitchen of their house. When they got there, Domingo "in a low and soft voice" asked Antonio what he was doing to Igleceria, and requested him to release her. Antonio angrily retorted, "Who are you?!" and freed Igleceria. He then boxed Domingo on the stomach.[17] At that point, Igleceria and Jeanita went up the stairs of their house and locked themselves inside a room. They heard that Antonio and Domingo had brought their fight outside their house. They opened a window and saw Antonio bleeding. Allegedly, they did not see Domingo carrying any bladed instrument, nor did they see any such weapon lying on the ground.[18] For his part, however, Domingo testified that after Antonio boxed him, he got hold of a knife and stabbed Antonio twice in the abdomen.[19]

Although bleeding, Antonio managed to stay standing, and still threatened the Eustaquios he would come back to kill them. Domingo then got a piece of bamboo and hit Antonio several times on different parts of his head and body, until he fell to the ground dead.[20] Domingo then informed Igleceria and Jeanita he was going to Balud to surrender to the authorities. He left.[21]

The defense likewise presented testimonial[22] and documentary evidence to prove that Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio was not in Sitio San Francisco, on May 3, 1990. The documentary evidence is the certification (Exh. "1") made by Paquito A. Adrias, Barangay Captain of Dao, Balud, Masbate, which as translated in English, reads:

### **"CERTIFICATION**

"Jean Eustaquio on May 3, 1990 at 10:00 o'clock in the morning, Thursday, was at Barangay Dao attending the meeting and when a roll call of the constituents of barangay Dao, Balud, Masbate was called, he was present. This Jean Eustaquio is farming at Dao on the land of Antonio Arnaldo and he is staying in his own house. We signed this certification to affirm that on that day, he is at our barangay Dao, Balud, Masbate.

"In truth in this certification I affixed my signature this 12th day of February, 1991, at Dao, Balud, Masbate.

(sgd)

PAQUITO A. ADRIAS

Barangay Captain

WITNESSES:

BARANGAY COUNCILMEN:

1. (sgd) Charito Arnaldo
2. (sgd) Elem Alayon
3. (sgd) Rogelio Romero

4. (sgd) Hospicio Cioco

5. (sgd) Dionono Damasco"

After trial, the lower court convicted the Eustaquios for Murder. Domingo and Jean Eustaquio were found guilty as principals, while Igleceria Eustaquio was convicted as an accomplice. They were sentenced as follows:

"WHEREFORE, from all these premises as testified and assessed by the court there is no doubt that the crime has been committed by all the accused beyond reasonable doubt with Domingo Eustaquio and Jean Eustaquio (Nonong Eustaquio) as the principals by direct participation with mitigating circumstance of voluntary surrender of Domingo Eustaquio, and Igleceria Eustaquio being just an accomplice will be penalized with one degree lower after the application of the Indeterminate Sentence Law.

"With these findings, Jean (Nonong) Eustaquio, there being no mitigating circumstances in his favor and the crime of murder being committed in conspiracy as alleged in the information he is hereby sentenced to suffer an imprisonment of RECLUSION PERPETUA to be served at the National Penitentiary.

"As to accused Domingo Eustaquio, there being a mitigating circumstance of voluntary surrender and after applying the Indeterminate Sentence Law he is hereby sentenced to suffer an imprisonment of SIX (6) YEARS, ONE (1) DAY of the minimum of prison mayor to TEN (10) YEARS, ONE (1) DAY of the maximum.

"As for Igleceria Eustaquio, she being just an accomplice, she is hereby sentenced to suffer an imprisonment of SIX (6) MONTHS, ONE (1) DAY as minimum to FOUR (4) YEARS, TWO (2) MONTHS as maximum of prison correctional. They are all hereby sentenced to indemnify the heirs of the victim Antonio Dante in the amount of P50,000.00 in solidum and to pay the costs.

"As for accused Nonoy Ruado, the case as against him is hereby placed in archives as he has not been brought within the jurisdiction of this court. The case as against him will just be revived upon his arrest.

"IT IS SO ORDERED."

Only Domingo and Jean Eustaquio appealed their conviction. They now contend:

"THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN NOT ACQUITTING APPELLANT JEAN EUSTAQUIO, THE EVIDENCE OF THE PROSECUTION FAILED TO MEET THE TEST OF MORAL CERTAINTY OF APPELLANT'S GUILT AND TO OVERCOME THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE IN HIS FAVOR;" and

"THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN NOT APPRECIATING THE CLAIM OF APPELLANT DOMINGO EUSTAQUIO OF DEFENSE OF RELATIVE AND AS SUCH ERRED IN NOT ACQUITTING APPELLANT."

We find no merit in the appeal.

We shall first resolve the defense of alibi foisted by accused-appellant Jean Eustaquio. The worn-out rule is that the defense of alibi is inherently weak. Time and again, we have disregarded this defense in view of the ease with which it is concocted, and we find no reason to give it credence in the case at bench.

The trial court rightly gave little weight to the certification of the barangay captain of Dao in view of the positive identification of accused-appellants Domingo and Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio by the two prosecution eye-witnesses as the perpetrators of the murder of the deceased Antonio. Witness Elma Fuentes testified:

"Q (Atty. Manlapaz)

At that time where were you proceeding to?

"A We were going home, and when we reached the house of Domingo Eustaquio my father was called by him.

"Q Who is this Domingo who you said called your father? Is he one of the accused in this case?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q If Domingo Eustaquio is in Court would you be able to point to him?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q Please point to him.

(Witness pointed to a man seated at the left corner of the last row of the bench of the courtroom and when asked about his name, identified himself as Domingo Eustaquio.

"Q After your father was called by Domingo Eustaquio what happened next?

"A When my father was called by Domingo Eustaquio, he went near the house of Domingo but we were left behind not far from the house and I saw that my father was being mauled by them.

"Q Who were the companions of Domingo Eustaquio when your father was mauled?

"A His wife Igleceria Eustaquio, Nonoy Eustaquio, Nonong Ruado.

"Q If Igleceria Eustaquio and Nonoy Eustaquio are in court, could you point to them?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q Please point to Igleceria.

(Witness pointing to a woman seated at the last row of the courtroom, and when asked about her name, identified herself as Igleceria Eustaquio.

"Q And where is Nonoy Eustaquio if he is in court, could you point to him?

(Witness pointed to a man seated in the middle row of the bench of the courtroom, and when asked about his name, identified himself as Nonoy Eustaquio.

"Q What about Nonong Ruado if he is in court, could you please point to him?

"A I could point to him, but he is not present in court.

"Q Do you know the relationship between Domingo Eustaquio and Igleceria Eustaquio?

"A Yes, sir. They are husband and wife.

"Q What about Nonoy Eustaquio, how is he related to Domingo Eustaquio and Igleceria Eustaquio?

"A He is the son of Igleceria and Domingo Eustaquio.

"Q Now, you said these accused helped in mauling your father Antonio Dante. Will you please tell us what weapon was used?

"A Domingo was using a bolo.

"Q What about Igleceria, what did she use?

"A Bamboo

"Q How long was that bamboo used by Igleceria?

"A About one (1) meter long.

"Q What about Nonoy Eustaquio, what did he use?

"A Iron bar.

"Q What about Nonong Ruado, what did he use?

"A Bamboo

"Q How long?

"A Around one meter.

"Q Will you also tell us who was the first to attack your father among the four?

"A Domingo.

"Q You said that Domingo Eustaquio used a bolo in attacking your father. Do you know if your father was hit by the attack with the bolo by Domingo Eustaquio?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q What part of his body was hit?

"A At his side of the body.

"COURT

"Q Right side or left side?

"A Right side.

"Atty. Manlapaz

(continuing)

"Q How many times did Domingo Eustaquio hack your father?

"A Two times.

"Q And the second time?

"A In his abdomen.

"Q You also said that Nonoy Eustaquio used an iron bar. How long was that iron bar used by Nonoy Eustaquio?

"A Around one arm length.

"Q And how did Nonoy Eustaquio use that iron bar in attacking your father?

"A He hit my father on his lower limb.

"Q And what about Igleceria Eustaquio? You said she used a bamboo about a meter long. Was your father also attacked by Igleceria Eustaquio?

"A Yes, sir.

"COURT

"Q Were they all armed?

"A Yes, sir.

(TSN of January 29, 1991, pp. 3-5)

Similarly, witness Aurelia Dante declared:

"Q (Atty. Manlapaz)

Before he was stabbed, will you please tell the court the circumstances surrounding the stabbing?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q Please tell.

"A My husband was stabbed by Domingo Eustaquio on his right side. (Witness demonstrating by pointing to the right side of her body)

"Q What did Domingo Eustaquio use in stabbing your husband?

"A A bolo

"Q How many times did Domingo Eustaquio stab your husband?

"A For two times.

"Q You said when he was stabbed first, he was hit on the right side of his body. The second time, where was he hit?

"A On his upper abdomen.

"x x x

"Q Do you know one Igleceria Eustaquio?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q How is she related to Domingo Eustaquio?

"A She is the wife of Domingo Eustaquio.

"Q Where was Igleceria Eustaquio at the time your husband was stabbed?

"A They helped one another.

"Q Who were those who helped stabbing your husband?

"A Domingo Eustaquio, Igleceria Eustaquio, Nonoy Eustaquio and Nonong Ruado.

"Q If accused Domingo Eustaquio is in court, will you please point to him?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q Please point to him, to Domingo Eustaquio.

"A That man. (Witness pointing to a man seated within the courtroom who when asked to identify himself, answered his name is Domingo Eustaquio.)

"Q Do you know all the accused previous to the incident?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q For how many years?

"A For a long time already.

"Q If accused Igleceria Eustaquio is in court, will you please point to her?

(Witness pointed to a woman seated within the courtroom who, when asked to identify herself, answered her name is Igleceria Eustaquio.)

"Q Will you please also point to accused Nonoy Eustaquio.

(Witness pointed to a man seated on the third row of the bench who, when asked to identify himself, answered his name is Nonoy Eustaquio.)

"Q Will you please point to Nonong Ruado if he is in court.

"A He is not in court.

"Q You said that these four accused helped each other in killing your husband will you please tell us what weapon did Igleceria use?

"A Piece of bamboo.

"Q What about Nonoy Eustaquio, what did he use?

"A Iron Bar.

"Q What about Nonong Ruado, what did he use?

"A Piece of bamboo.

"Q You said Igleceria Eustaquio used bamboo in attacking your husband. Do you know whether your husband was hit when Igleceria Eustaquio attacked him with a bamboo?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q Where was your husband hit by Igleceria?

(Witness pointing at her neck)

"Q How many times did Igleceria attack your husband with a bamboo?

"A Several times.

"Q What about Nonoy Eustaquio who you said used an iron bar and you said also helped. Was your husband hit when he was attacked by Nonoy Eustaquio?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q Where was he hit by Nonoy Eustaquio?

(Witness pointing to the lower part of her knee.)

"Q And you said Nonong Ruado also helped in attacking your husband with the use of bamboo. Was your husband also hit by Nonong Ruado?

"A Yes, sir.

"Q Where was your husband hit?

(Witness demonstrating that her husband was hit on his nape.)

"COURT Is this the same bamboo which was used by Ruado which was also used by Nonong?

"A Different, Your Honor."

(TSN of January 30, 1991, pp. 2-5)

We cannot downgrade the credibility of Elma and Aurelia. As daughter and wife, respectively, of the deceased Antonio, they were genuinely interested in prosecuting the real killers of Antonio. They wanted justice to be done and justice will not be done if they were to perjure themselves. Before the incident, they had no axe to grind against accused-appellants, hence, were bereft of any ill-motive to implicate them falsely.

Further, it must be noted that neither the barangay captain of Dao, Balud, Masbate, nor any of the five (5) councilmen who signed the certification (Exh. "1") presented by Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio, testified before the trial court on his presence in Dao on May 3, 1990. They were not even presented to authenticate the said document. Hence, the trial court ruled correctly when it rejected the said certification as devoid of any evidentiary weight.

It was also established that the distance between Dao, Balud, Masbate and the scene of the crime could be negotiated by a 30-minute walk.[23] It is thus possible that said accused-appellant Jean (alias Nonoy) Eustaquio could have left the Dao barangay meeting (which was attended by hundreds of people) after his turn in the roll call to commit the crime at bench. In fine, he was unable to establish beyond doubt the impossibility of his presence at the scene of the crime.

We now come to the appeal of Domingo Eustaquio. We have no reason to disturb the trial court's ruling that the defense version of the killing of the victim is incredible. The version is incongruous with reality. The defense would want us to believe that the deceased, Antonio, would suddenly attempt to rape Igleceria Eustaquio; and then follow through on his threat, not by making lascivious acts towards her, but by grabbing the collar and side of her dress. As if this were not enough, the defense peddled the downright incredible reaction of accused-appellant Domingo to the alleged attack by the deceased Antonio on Igleceria. The defense claimed that he went "casually" to the kitchen without arming himself in any way, even though he knew that Antonio was bigger than him. Then, according to the testimony of Jeanita, Domingo, "in a low and soft voice," asked Antonio what he was doing to Igleceria.

To top it all, the Eustaquios claimed that Domingo single-handedly inflicted the numerous injuries sustained by the deceased Antonio by first stabbing him, and then finishing him off with a piece of bamboo. It offends common sense why a man, who is defending the honor of his wife, would discard the bladed weapon he had used to stab his bigger and sturdier opponent, and pick up a mere piece of bamboo to finish off his opponent.

The defense's story was an obvious fabrication. It was intended to shield the other members of the Eustaquio family from prosecution by showing that accused-appellant Domingo alone killed the deceased. It was also designed to provide Domingo with a justifying circumstance for such killing, the alleged attack on the honor of his wife, Igleceria.

We note that the lower court erred in imposing the penalty of six (6) years, one (1) day of the minimum of prison mayor, to ten (10) years and one (1) day of its maximum. The penalty imposed by Art. 248 of the Revised Penal Code for Murder is reclusion temporal in its maximum period, to death, and Art. 64(2) of the same Code, provides

that "(w)hen only a mitigating circumstance is present in the commission of the act, they shall impose the penalty in its minimum period." Applying the Indeterminate Sentence Law, and considering that accused-appellant Domingo Eustaquio has the mitigating circumstance of voluntary surrender to his credit, without any corresponding aggravating circumstance, we impose on him the penalty of from ten (10) years and one (1) day of prision mayor in its maximum period, to seventeen (17) years, four (4) months and one (1) day of reclusion temporal in its maximum period.

IN VIEW WHEREOF, the decision of the court, a quo, finding accused-appellants DOMINGO EUSTAQUIO and JEAN EUSTAQUIO guilty as principals by direct participation of the crime of Murder, is AFFIRMED. The dispositive portion of the decision is MODIFIED. We impose on accused-appellant DOMINGO EUSTAQUIO the penalty of from ten (10) years and one (1) day of prision mayor, to seventeen (17) years, four (4) months and one (1) day of reclusion temporal. Costs against accused-appellants.

**SO ORDERED.**

Narvasa, C.J., (Chairman), Padilla, Regalado, and Nocon, JJ., concur.

---

[1] Presided by Judge Manuel C. Cenova. Igleceria Eustaquio was also convicted but did not appeal her conviction.

[2] TSN of January 29, 1991, p. 3; TSN of January 30, 1991.

[3] Ibid., TSN of January 29, 1991; TSN of January 30, 1991, pp. 2, 15-16.

[4] Id..

[5] TSN of January 29, 1991, pp. 4-5; TSN of January 30, 1991, pp. 2-5.

[6] Ibid., TSN of January 29, 1991.

[7] Id., TSN of January 29, 1991; TSN of January 30, 1991, p. 6.

[8] TSN of January 29, 1991, p. 6; Ibid., TSN of January 30, 1991.

[9] Ibid., TSN of January 29, 1991; TSN of January 30, 1991, p. 7.

[10] Id., TSN of January 29, 1991; Ibid., TSN of January 30, 1991.

[11] Id., TSN of January 29, 1991.

[12] Dr. Aguilar testified regarding his findings during the post-mortem examination of Antonio's body on November 23, 1990 and on March 25, 1991.

[13] TSN of May 15, 1991, pp. 1-3; TSN of May 16, 1991, pp. 2-3; TSN of August 21, 1991, pp. 1-3.

[14] TSN of May 15, 1991, p. 4; TSN of May 16, 1991, pp. 4, 14.

[15] Ibid., TSN of May 15, 1991; TSN of May 16, 1991, pp. 4-5; TSN of August 21, 1991, p. 3.

[16] TSN of May 15, 1991, pp. 4-6, 12-14.

[17] TSN of May 16, 1991, pp. 5-6, 16-18; TSN of August 21, 1991, pp. 3-4.

[18] TSN of May 15, 1991, p. 7; TSN of May 16, 1991, pp. 6-7, 18-19.

[19] TSN of August 21, 1991, p. 4.

[20] TSN of May 15, 1991, p. 7; TSN of August 21, 1991, p. 5.

[21] Ibid., TSN of May 15, 1991; TSN of August 21, 1991, p. 6.

[22] Domingo, Igleceria and Jeanita Eustaquio testified that Jean (alias Nonoy) was not in their house on May 3, 1990. The defense also presented QUIRINO ARCHIVO who testified that Jean was in Sitio Dao, Balud, Masbate attending a barangay meeting which lasted from 9:00 o'clock in the morning to 12:00 o'clock noon. Archivo further testified that around 300 people attended the meeting.

[23] Decision of the RTC, dated January 13, 1992, p. 3.

**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.