

**THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS.
BENEDICTO CAMPA, MATEO CAMPA, PROCESO CAMPA, JIMMY
CAMPA, AND DALMACIO CAMPA, ACCUSED-APPELLANTS.**

G.R. No. 105391. February 28, 1994

Ponente: NARVASA, C.J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-105391/>

NARVASA, C.J.:

It would appear that in some men the veneer of civilization is so thin and fragile the slightest offense will blow it away to expose the savage underneath. Any affront, imagined or otherwise, transforms them into "brutish beasts," seemingly in an instant; they become so suddenly filled with ungovernable rage that they turn on their fellow man and put him to death, pitilessly and cruelly.

One such transformation apparently took place at a dance party in the home of Benedicto Campa, Sr. in Hda. Galispin, Barangay Mansilingan, Bacolod City, in the evening of January 24, 1984. The party was in celebration of the birthday of Benedicto's daughter, Maria Fe; and Benedicto's yard had been decorated and brightly illuminated with kerosene torches for dancing by the guests.

To this dance came guests from Hda. Garcia, about a kilometer away: Josefino Jagocoy, Freddie Mojica, Ricardo Pagunsan, Jr., Jessie Parcon and Noli Malayang. At about 10 o'clock that night; after dancing had been going on for about two (2) hours, Josefino Jagocoy asked Mila, the wife of Dalmacio Campa, for a dance. Mila (a.k.a. Indang) turned down Josefino's invitation, saying she was a married woman; but Josefino allegedly tried to pull her towards the dance area. Mila evidently felt so outraged that, "screaming and shouting," she went up to the house of Benedicto Campa, Sr., her father-in-law.[1]

Some five minutes later, the people at the dance were startled to see a person -- later identified as one Jun Aspan of Hda. Galispin -- jump down from Benedicto Campa's house, pursued by the Campa brothers and George Villacampa. The pursuers returned after a short while and forthwith approached Josefino Jagocoy, who was standing at one side of Benedicto Campa's yard, leaning on a bamboo pole.

Without warning, George Villacampa hit Josefino on the shoulder with a cane cutter. Josefino fell on his buttocks and while thus positioned on the ground, was again hacked with the cane cutter by Villacampa. Dalmacio Campa then stabbed Josefino twice in the abdomen with a double-bladed copper knife; and Dalmacio's brother, Jimmy Campa, also stabbed Josefino with a stainless steel knife.[2] The other Campa brothers -- Proceso, Mateo and Benedicto, Jr. -- surrounded Josefino and struck out at him with cane cutters.

One of those who had come to the dance with the luckless Josefino, Freddie Mojica, cried out to the assailants to stop, saying Josefino was the younger brother of "Tio Badong." But his outcry only resulted in his being himself attacked. Jimmy Campa came at Freddie with a knife thrust which the latter was able to avoid. Benedicto Campa, Jr. lashed out at Freddie with a cane cutter, hitting him in the forehead and the right arm. Freddie Mojica fled towards a nearby creek and hid in a bamboo clump. His companions, Ricardo Pagunsan, Jr., Jessie Parcon and Noli Malayang, above named, also took to their heels, scampering away in all directions, like the other frightened

guests.

After this feral outburst, which could not have lasted more than a few minutes, Josefino Jagocoy was taken to the Bacolod Doctors Hospital. He was attended to at the Emergency Room by Dr. Roberto L. Garcia. Josefino was able to speak to the police investigator, Pat. Oscar Flor, to whom he identified his attackers. Josefino died the next day, January 25, 1984, after he was operated on in an attempt to save his life.

The foregoing facts were testified to mainly by prosecution witnesses at the trial of Benedicto Campa, Mateo Campa, Proceso Campa, Jimmy Campa, and Dalmacio Campa before the Regional Trial Court at Bacolod City, Branch 48.[3] They -- together with George Villacampa, who however was never arrested and hence, never arraigned -- were accused of the murder of Josefino Jagocoy under an information dated January 30, 1984,[4] and in respect of which they had in due course entered a plea of not guilty.

On the other hand, the defense sought to establish a different version of the occurrence. As summarized by the Trial Court,[5] the defendants theorized :

" * * that it was George Villacampa alone who inflicted the wounds upon the deceased triggered by the fact that latter forced Mila, also known as Indang, the wife of Dalmacio Campa, to dance with him. After the deceased had forcibly pulled Indang's hand, the former was admonished by Benedicto Campa, Sr. of the fact that the latter is married. However, the deceased retorted, 'So what!'. Thereafter, Villacampa, a hired worker of Benedicto Campa, St., stepped down from the house and admonished the deceased but the latter flashed his flashlight on the former's face and once again retorted, 'So what!'. It was when the deceased made motions of taking out something from his hip that accused Villacampa hacked the former with a sugar cane cutter at the back. The deceased, however, managed to escape together with his friends Pagunsan and Mojica towards the thicket and being chased by Villacampa and his companions. The Campa brothers were not with Villacampa at that point in time though, as they were all inside the house with their wives and children. Thereafter, stones were thrown at the house of the Campa's. It was at this moment when Dalmacio Campa went down from his father's house after having been awakened from sleep by the noise. However, testimony of defense witness, Carmela Salanap, varied considering that she testified that an argument first ensued inside the house. She added that the deceased was not arguing with the accused Villacampa at the moment of the incident but was about to dance with an unidentified woman. For reasons unknown to witness Salanap, accused Villacampa rushed towards the deceased and hacked the latter. Witness did not see what occurred next because she ran to hide under the Campa's house. Only after she went out from her hiding place had she met the accused Villacampa who uttered the words, 'He will not survive anymore because he will die.' Defense witness, Benedicto Campa, Sr., likewise added that his sons were inside his house when accused Villacampa first hacked Jagocoy and it was only after, when everything returned to normal that his sons went out of the house and inquired what happened."

The Trial Court concluded that the prosecution had "satisfactorily established with moral certainty the guilt of the accused in conspiring to kill the deceased Josefino Jagocoy beyond reasonable doubt * * ;"[6] and that, on the other hand, "testimony of defense witnesses presented conflicting statements that were unreliable and of doubtful veracity, if not downright incredible."[7] It rendered judgment on January 31, 1989, containing the following dispositive portion, to wit:[8]

"WHEREFORE, from the evidence presented, the Court finds the accused Benedicto Campa, Jr., Mateo Campa, Proceso Campa, Jimmy Campa and Dalmacio Campa GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of Murder (George Villacampa being still at large and has never been arraigned) and shall suffer the penalty of life imprisonment for the death of the victim, with each accessory penalty provided for in Article 41 of the Revised Penal Code and to indemnify the heirs of Josefino Jagocoy the sum of Sixteen Thousand Pesos (P16,000.00) each. Without costs."

The defendants moved for reconsideration of the condemnatory judgment, and when this was denied, perfected an appeal therefrom. In their brief, they seek reversal of the verdict of conviction entered against them (or at least, the reduction of the penalty imposed) upon the following arguments:[9]

1. The testimony of Freddie Mojica "is at best, shaky," "is not in accord with normal or common human habit or tendency;"[10] the matter "is more akin to death caused in a tumultuous (sic) affray;"[11] the illumination at the scene of the crime came from "michas," ** "small kerosene lamps that can hardly illuminate a room, much less a space where dancing is held;"[12] and "no motive at all has been established by the prosecution on the part of the appellants for them to harbor ill-will or a desire to kill the deceased." [13]
2. The medical certificate issued by Dr. Roberto Garcia (Exh. E) enumerating only four stab wounds, belies the evidence given by the prosecution witnesses.[14]
3. "(N)o evidence was ever presented to substantiate ** (the) qualifying circumstance of evident premeditation;" hence, it was error to convict the appellants of murder.[15]
4. The fact that stones were thrown at the house of the Campas warranted the appreciation in favor of the accused of the mitigating circumstance of passion and/or obfuscation.[16]
5. The mitigating circumstance of voluntary surrender should also have been appreciated in their favor.[17]

A reading of the testimony of Freddie Mojica immediately impels rejection of its description as "shaky," or as lacking in credibility. It is moreover corroborated in all substantial aspects by another prosecution witness, Ricardo Pagunsan, Jr. Both Mojica and Pagunsan positively identified the assailants, and described their individual acts of violence and the weapons respectively used by them against the victim.

Freddie Mojica's testimony is pertinently as follows:[18]

“Q Will you tell the Honorable Court what was the incident that took place around 10:00 in the evening of January 24, 1984 when you were sitting on the bamboo bench near the house of the Campas?

A While I was sitting there at the bamboo bench near the house of the Campas watching people dancing on the dance floor suddenly there was a commotion. I saw people running because there was a person who jumped from the house of (the) Campas and was being chased but I do not know that person.

*** **

Q And who were the persons who chased that fellow who jumped from the house of (the) Campas?

A George Villacampa and the five (5) Campa brothers.

Q And who were these five Campa brothers ***?

A Proceso, Dalmacio, Mateo, Benedicto and Jimmy.

Q These five Campa brothers you mentioned (and) are they the same *** Campa(s) who are now the accused in this case?

A Yes, Ma'am.

*** **

Q You said that the accused here George Villacampa and the Campa brothers x x x chased a person which (sic) you saw jumped from the house of Benedicto Campa, Sr., what happened after that?

A They later on came back and they approached Josefino Jagocoy who has (sic) his hand leaning on a bamboo

pole (and) was suddenly hacked by them.

Q Who hacked Josefino Jagocoy (sic)?

A It was George Villacampa.

Q What happened after Josefino Jagocoy was hit?

A He suddenly stepped backward.

Q What happened?

A He fell on his buttocks and suddenly turned.

Q And what did he do?

A He turned and attempted to run.

Q What happened?

A He was again hacked by George Villacampa on the shoulder.

Q What happened after that?

A After he was hacked by George Villacampa Josefino Jagocoy suddenly squatted.

Q Do you mean to say after he was hit on the shoulder?

A Yes, sir.

Q What happened after that?

A Dalmacio also stabbed him.

Q Was Josefino Jagocoy hit?

A Yes, sir.

Q How many times did Dalmacio Campa stab Josefino Jagocoy?

A He stabbed him twice.

Q Do you know where or did you see where Josefino Jagocoy was hit the first time he was stabbed by Dalmacio Campa?

A Yes, sir.

Q Where?

A He was hit on the left abdomen.

Q How about the second time *** ?

A He was hit on the right abdomen.

Q What happened after that?

A And thereafter Jimmy followed.

Q Followed what?

A And Jimmy stabbed him on the left shoulder, blade.

Q How many times did Jimmy Campa stab Josefino Jagocoy?

A He stabbed him twice.

Q And Josefino Jagocoy was also hit on the second time by Jimmy Campa?

A Yes, sir.

Q How about Proceso, Mateo and Benedicto, Jr. where were they at that time?

A They were surrounding Josefino Jogocoy.

Q What did Proceso Campa do?

A Proceso Campa hacked him.

Q Hacked who?

A He hacked Josefino Jagocoy.

Q How about this Mateo Campa, what did he do?

A He also hacked and throw (sic) stone at him.

Q How about, Benedicto Campa, what did he do?

A He also hacked.

Q Who?

A Josefino 'Jagocoy.'

The corroborating part of the testimony of Ricardo Pagunsan, Jr.,[19] is pertinently as follows:

"Q At around ten o'clock that evening, of January 24, 1984, you said you were still there at the house of Benedicto Campa, Sr. Do you recall any incident that called your attention that took place there?

A Yes, there was.

"Q Will you inform this Honorable Court what was that incident ***

A After the dance there was a man who jumped from the house of Benedicto Campa, Sr. and he was chased by George (sic) Villacampa followed by the Campa brothers and they passed by in front of us.

Q Who were these Campa brothers you mentioned? Please name them.

A Benedicto Campa, Jr., Mateo Campa, Proceso Campa, Dalmacio Campa, Juaning (sic) Campa and George Villacampa.

*** **

Q What happened after that?

A While we were. . . I was standing there with Josefino and George Villacampa approached us and hacked us with a bolo *** but we were not hit.

Q *** what happened next?

A Josefino fell on his buttocks and he moved to the sides (sic).

Q What happened after Josefino fell down on his buttocks?

A While he was attempting to run away he was downed.

Q Was Josefino hit when George Villacampa hit (sic) for the second time?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall where Josefino was hit?

A On the right shoulder.

Q What happened after that?

A I was not able to leave that place anymore. I just remained there.

Q What happened next?

A After that he was stabbed by Dalmacio Campa twice on the front portion of his body.

Q ***. What happened next after that?

A He was stabbed by Jimmy Campa twice also.

Q Was Josefino Jagocoy (hit) when Jimmy Campa stabbed him twice on the back?

A Yes.

Q After Jimmy Campa stabbed Josefino Jagocoy twice what happened next?

A He was hacked by Mateo Campa.

Q What weapon did Mateo Campa use in hacking Josefino Jagocoy?

A A sugarcane cutter.

Q After Mateo Campa hacked Josefino Jagocoy with a cane cutter, what happened next?

A He was hacked by Benedicto Campa, Jr.

Q What weapon did Benedicto Campa, Jr. use in hacking Josefino Jagocoy?

A Sugarcane cutter.

Q After Benedicto Campa, Jr. hacked Josefino Jagocoy with a cane cutter, what happened next?

A He was hacked by Proceso Campa.

Q ***, what weapon did Proceso Campa used (sic) in hacking Josefino Jogocoy?

A Sugarcane cutter.

Q What happened after Proceso Campa hacked Josefino Jagocoy with a cane cutter?

A The(y) left Josefino Jagocoy"

The foregoing testimonial proofs are wanting neither in certitude nor specificity, and considering their coherence and concordance, as well as the absence of proof of bias on the part of the witnesses or other motive to give false evidence, cannot be ignored, much less denied credence. The accord of full faith and credit to said proofs by the Trial Court must be sustained.

The manner by which the killing of Josefino was carried out, as thus described by the witnesses, persuasively

demonstrates that the assailants were all moved by one common purpose: if not precisely to slay Josefino, certainly to inflict serious injuries on him with the weapons they each had in hand; and in the effectuation of that purpose, they intended to and did in fact help one another. They came at Josefino together, each with a weapon; they encircled their victim and they all stabbed him, or hit him with cane cutters; they did not cease until Josefino had been stabbed and cut, and lay prostrate, his blood spilling to the ground from several wounds, some fatal, others superficial. They acted in conspiracy, each performing specific acts in the killing of Josefino with such closeness and coordination as unmistakably to indicate a common purpose or design.[20]

The testimony of Mojica and Pagunsan is not enfeebled by the claim that the illumination at the scene of the crime was so dim as to render accurate identification extremely difficult if not impossible. That claim is simply not borne out by the evidence which, on the contrary tends to establish that the place was well lit with many kerosene lamps (michas), and that there was, in fact, a kerosene torch right at the portion of the yard where Freddie Mojica and other persons were seated.[21]

The identities of the assailants must also be taken as satisfactorily established. Their identification by Mojica and Pagunsan cannot be faulted. Not only were they, like the appellants, long-time residents of Mansilingan, Bacolod City,[22] their faces would in the very nature of things, also have been forcefully impinged upon and etched into the witnesses' memories by the acts of ferocity perpetrated before their eyes. Moreover, when interviewed shortly before he expired from his mortal wounds, the victim himself named the Campa brothers and Villacampa as the persons who had attacked him, to the police investigator, Pat. Oscar Flor.[23]

Appellants would discredit the testimony of Mojica and Pagunsan by advertng to the medical certificate (Exh. E) issued by Dr. Roberto Garcia, who conducted the autopsy on the deceased. They argue that since that certificate enumerates only four (4) stab wounds, it could not be true that the victim was also attacked and wounded with the cane cutters with which some of the appellants were supposedly armed since these cutters were capable of inflicting only slashing or cutting injuries, not stab or puncturing wounds. It should however be pointed out that Dr. Garcia testified that he had listed in the medical certificate only the "major wounds" -- the four (4) stab wounds -- but that there were other wounds not listed, "minor" in nature being mere lacerations.[24] Indeed, the medical certificate, insofar as it specifies that there were four (4) stab wounds on the cadaver, is entirely consistent with the testimony of Freddie Mojica and Ricardo Pagunsan, Jr., both of whom declared on the witness stand that Dalmacio Campa had stabbed the victim twice, as had his brother, Jimmy Campa, supra. The hacking wounds (lacerations) were evidently not deemed "major" by Dr. Garcia, and were consequently not listed in the medical certificate; the lacerations obviously were the wounds inflicted by the cane cutters. Moreover, that the victim suffered more injuries than the four (4) "major" ones listed by Dr. Garcia in the medical certificate (Exh. E) is also established by the testimony of Pat. Oscar Flor, of the Homicide Section of the Bacolod Police Force, who deposed that he had counted "fourteen (14) wounds or injuries sustained by the victim including lacerations and contusions." [25]

The defense contends that no reason at all has been established by the prosecution for the appellants to harbor ill-will or a desire to kill the deceased. In the first place, motive is inconsequential where there is otherwise affirmative evidence of the identity of the malefactors and of their acts or omissions. In the second place, the defense evidence itself demonstrates the existence of cause for resentment on the appellants' part. As stressed in the appellee's brief:[26]

" * * . Defense witness Renato Bautista testified that when Indang (the wife of Dalmacio Campa) refused to dance with the victim because she is already married, she went up the house 'screaming and shouting' (p. 35, TSN, February 29, 1985). This was corroborated by another defense witness, Carmela Salanap, who stated that the incident of January 24, 1984 was 'in connection with a dance' which resulted in 'an argument upstairs' (p.

8, TSN, March 18, 1985).

Benedicto Campa, Sr., father of accused-appellants, also testified that the incident started when Josefino Jagocoy asked Indang (his daughter-in-law) for a dance and, when the latter refused, Jagocoy allegedly pulled her towards the center of the dance hall (pp. 5-6, TSN, June 5, 1985) This untoward incident between Indang and Jagocoy provided the motive that precipitated the latter's killing by Villacampa and the Campa brothers."

There was a here a physical assault by a group of identified men against a common, particular victim, and not, as the defense suggests, a "tumultuous affray" within the meaning of Article 251 of the Revised Penal Code,[27] i.e., a melee or free-for-all, where several persons not comprising definite or identifiable groups attack one another in a confused and disorganized manner, resulting in the death or injury of one or some of them.

The crime actually proven, however, is not murder but homicide simply, neither of the two (2) qualifying circumstances alleged in the information, treachery and evident premeditation, having been adequately established. As depicted by the proofs, the attack on Josefino Jagocoy was made overtly, frontally, no effort having been exerted to employ means, methods and forms in the perpetration of the killing tending directly and especially to insure its execution without risk to the offenders arising from the defense which the offended party might make.[28] Neither do the proofs demonstrate evident premeditation on appellants' part; indeed, no finding of its existence has been made by the Court a quo.

The Court however agrees with the appellee that the commission of the crime was attended by the generic aggravating circumstance of advantage being taken of superior strength.[29]

"In the instant case, superior strength was taken advantage of when Villacampa and the five (5) Campa brothers, who were all armed with bladed weapons, ganged up and attacked Josefino Jagocoy, the victim who was unarmed, resulting in the latter's death. In *People vs Alitao* (194 SCRA 120 [1991]), this Honorable Court held that there was abuse of superior strength where the evidence showed that the victim was unarmed while he was simultaneously attacked by the appellants, all of them with weapons.

Since superior strength was not alleged as a qualifying circumstance in the information, its attendance in the killing incident cannot qualify the crime to murder. However, it can be taken as a generic aggravating circumstance to the crime of homicide (Luis B. Reyes, *The revised Penal Code*, Rex Printing Company, Inc., Quezon City, Vol. II, Twelfth Edition, p. 462)."

The mitigating circumstances of passion or obfuscation, and voluntary surrender may not be appreciated in favor of the appellants, as they pray. According to them, they were overcome by passion when stones were hurled at their house by some unidentified individuals. There is no sufficient evidence of this stoning incident and even if there were, there is no proof whatever that the victim was in any way responsible therefor so as to be made the subject of appellants' overwhelming rage. Nor is there any indication in the record that appellants had, of their own volition, come forward and presented themselves before the authorities, signifying their desire to spare the Government the time, effort and expense of seeking them out; what happened simply was that they willingly accepted the invitation of police officers to undergo investigation for the killing of Josefino Jagocoy.

One last word. The Trial Court erroneously imposed the penalty of "life imprisonment" for a felony defined and punished by the Revised Penal Code. Once again the Court wishes to point out that "life imprisonment" is not the same as the penalty of reclusion perpetua provided for in the Revised Penal Code for certain specific offenses, and that "life imprisonment" is not one of the penalties prescribed by the Code.

WHEREFORE, modifying the judgment of the Court a quo, the accused-appellants -- Benedicto Campa, Mateo Campa, Proceso Campa, Jimmy Campa, and Dalmacio Campa -- are hereby declared guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the felony of homicide under Article 249 of the Revised Penal Code, with the attendance of the generic

aggravating circumstance of advantage of superior strength; and they are accordingly each SENTENCED to the indeterminate penalty of eleven (11) years of prision mayor, as minimum, to nineteen (19) years of reclusion temporal, as maximum; to indemnify in solidum the heirs of Josefino Jagocoy in the sum of Fifty Thousand Pesos (P50,000.00); and to pay the costs.

SO ORDERED.

Padilla, Regalado, Nocon, and Puno, JJ., concur.

[1] TSN, June 5, 1985, pp. 5-6: testimony of Benedicto Campa, Sr.; TSN, Feb. 29, 1985, p. 35: testimony of defense witness Renato Bautista; TSN, March 18, 1985, p. 8: testimony of Carmela Salanap

[2] TSN, Aug 29, 1984, pp. 12-14

[3] Rollo, pp. 51-52; 67-69

[4] Id., pp. 11-12

[5] Id., pp. 52-53

[6] Id., p. 54

[7] Id.

[8] Id., p. 56

[9] Culled from their submittals under an assignment of seven (7) errors

[10] Rollo, pp. 40, 42-45

[11] Id., pp. 40-41

[12] Id., p. 41

[13] Id., p. 42

[14] Id., pp. 45-46

[15] Id., pp. 46-47

[16] Id., pp. 47-48

[17] Id., pp. 48-49

[18] TSN, Aug. 29, 1984, pp. 5-11; emphasis supplied

[19] TSN, Nov. 7, 1984, pp.. 9-18; italics supplied

[20] Peo. v. Petenia, 143 SCRA 361 (1986); Peo. v. Manalo, 133 SCRA 626 (1984); Peo. v. Dalusag, 133 SCRA 15; Peo. v. Pagaduan, 29 SCRA 54 (1969)

[21] TSN, Aug. 20, 1984, p. 37; SEE also TSN, Nov. 21, 1984, pp. 18-19

[22] TSN, Aug. 29, 1984, p. 3; TSN, Nov. 7, 1988, p. 5

[23] TSN, Jan. 21, 1986, pp. 10-12

[24] TSN, Nov. 21, 1984, pp. 30-31

[25] TSN, Jan. 21, 1985, p. 12

[26] Rollo, pp. 82-83

[27] There is a "tumultuous affray," according to Article 251, when "several persons, not composing groups organized for the common purpose of assaulting and attacking each other reciprocally, quarrel and assault each other in a confused and tumultuous manner." The penalty prescribed, where it cannot be ascertained who actually killed the deceased or actually inflicted the injuries, is made dependent on whether death, or physical injuries result from the affray (Arts. 251 and 252).

[28] Art. 14 (16), Revised Penal Code

[29] Rollo, pp. 96-97

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.