

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. RODOLFO BERNALDEZ @ “DOLFO,” ACCUSED-APPELLANT.

G.R. No. 109780. August 17, 1998

Ponente: DAVIDE, JR., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-109780/>

DAVIDE, JR., J.:

This is an appeal from the decision[1] of Branch 14 of the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Ligao, Albay, convicting accused-appellant RODOLFO BERNALDEZ of rape committed against his 10-year old niece MARIA TERESA BERNALDEZ.[2]

The complaint[3] for reape was filed beofre the 6th Muunicipal Circuit Trial Court (MCTC) of Polangui-Libon, Albay, on September 1990 by Pedro B. Bernaldez, the younger brother of the appellant and father of the victim. RODOLFO was forthwith arrested and detained in jail.

After due proceedings in the MCTC, which found a probable cause against RODOLFO,[4] the Office of the Provincial Prosecutor of Albay filed with the RTC of Ligao, Albay, an information[5] charging him with the crime of rape committed as follows:

That in the morning of August 29, 1990, at Sitio Mabatia, Barangay Sugcad, Municipality of Polangui, Province of Albay, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, said accused, with lewd design, did then and there wilfully, unlawfully and feloniously have carnal knowledge of her 10-year old niece MARIA THERESA BERNALDEZ, to her damage and prejudice.

The case was docketed as Criminal Case No. 2763 and raffled to Branch 14 of said court.

RODOLFO entered a plea of innocence at his arraignment.[6]

At the trial on the merits, the prosecution presented as its witnesses MARIA TERESA and her father Pedro Bernaldez. Dr. Nancy de la Paz, who examined MARIA TERESA and issued the medical certificate, failed to testify.[7] For its part, the defense had as its witnesses RODOLFO; Delfin Paular, the overseer of the rice mill where RODOLFO allegedly worked; and Melita Sasota, the teacher of MARIA TERESA.

The evidence for the prosecution is summarized by the Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) in the Brief for the Appellee as follows:

Through complainant’s testimony, the prosecution was able to establish that in the morning of August 29, 1990, complainant, then [ten] years old, was raped by accused-appellant, her uncle, being the full-blooded brother of her father, at his house in Sitio Mabatia, Barangay Sugcad, Polangui, Albay. She narrated that she was carried by her uncle upstairs who then removed her clothes and let her lie down on the floor. While she was lying down, her uncle opened the zipper of his pants and laid on top of her, inserted his penis inside her vagina and made a push and pull movement while on top of her. After a while, a sticky and warm object came out from his penis. After the rape, accused-appellant gave her P5.00 and threatened her not to tell anybody otherwise, he would kill her parents, brothers and sisters. (TSN, March 1, 1991, pp.6-7). Complainant further

claimed that accused-appellant had been abusing her since five (5) years ago and these repeated acts were done in the same place, with accused-appellant always warning and threatening her not to tell anybody. (TSN, supra, pp.10-12).

On [August] 30, 1990, or the very next day after the last rape incident, complainant was sent by her father to go to accused-appellant's house in order to borrow P10.00 from him. However, complainant refused to go prompting her father to beat her. It was only then that she revealed to her father the cause of her reluctance and narrated to him the repeated rape and assaults of her uncle. Immediately after learning of the rape, her parents brought complainant to the Polangui Police Station to report the incident and file the complaint (TSN, supra p. 7). Complainant then executed a Sworn Statement before the police investigator (Exhs. A, A-1 and A-2). Afterwards, she was brought for treatment to Pio Duran Memorial District Hospital, a government hospital where she was examined by Dr. Maria Nancy de la Paz who issued a Medical Certificate dated September 3, 1990 (Exh. B). She likewise identified her Birth Certificate (Exh. C). Asked to identify her attacker, she readily identified accused-appellant in open court (TSN, supra, pp. 8-9).

Pedro Bernaldez, father of the complainant, testified that he is the younger brother of accused-appellant who lives in a separate house about two (2) "medium hills" away. He confirmed that he only discovered the rape on his daughter when she revealed to him the reason for her reluctance or fear in going to her uncle's (accused-appellant's) place when he sent her to borrow P10.00 from him on [August] 30, 1990. He likewise confirmed that the victim told him of the repeated rapes by her uncle since five (5) years ago, the last time being that done on [August] 29, 1990. These, his daughter revealed after he hit her with his belt several times for refusing to go as instructed. Fearing that something wrong would result if he directly confronted his brother, he decided to report the matter to the police authorities instead, which he immediately did. He also executed a Sworn Statement before the Polangui Police Station police investigator on September 2, 1990 (Exh. E). He further stressed that he had a good relationship with his brother and had no quarrel with him. (TSN, supra, pp. 17-21.).[8]

RODOLFO had alibi for his defense. According to him he could not have committed the crime charged because from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. of 29 August 1990, when the rape was allegedly committed, he was working as a mechanic/mill operator in the rice mill of William Cu, located 2 ½ to 3 kilometers from his house.[9] He was charged with rape because in the evening of 28 August 1990, he saw one "Rodolfo" wearing only "briefs" near the door of the house of his brother Pedro. Half a meter away from that man was Pedro's wife (MARIA TERESA's mother), who was then lying down on the floor wearing a sando and a skirt. The next day, Pedro had a drinking spree with this "Rodolfo"; "when he was already drunk," he filed the case against herein accused-appellant RODOLFO.[10]

Delfin Paular, the overseer at the rice mill where RODOLFO was allegedly working, testified that RODOLFO arrived at the rice mill at around 6:00 a.m. of 29 August 1990, and stayed there until 6:00 p.m. because nobody was available to "relieve" him.[11]

Melita Sasota, MARIA TERESA's teacher at North Central School, Polangui, Albay, testified that MARIA TERESA was present in her class on 29 August 1990 because her record of attendance was "clean" and not marked "absent." MARIA TERESA must have been already in school at around 6:30 a.m. and was inside the classroom when the bell rang at 7:15 a.m. However, Melita could not remember what time MARIA TERESA left school after the morning session and to where the latter went, although she saw the latter again at the start of the afternoon session until it ended at 4:20 p.m.[12]

In its decision of 19 January 1993, the trial court found RODOLFO guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of rape and sentenced him to suffer the penalty of reclusion perpetua. It also ordered him to pay MARIA TERESA P50,000 representing moral and exemplary damages, and to pay the costs.

The trial court held that the testimony of MARIA TERESA, who positively identified RODOLFO as the malefactor, was sufficient to prove RODOLFO's guilt. RODOLFO, as an uncle, had a great influence over MARIA TERESA, who, admittedly, was less than 12 years of age when the offense was committed; besides, there was intimidation consisting of the threat to kill her parents and brothers and sisters. Moreover, no reason or motive existed for MARIA TERESA or her father to fabricate the charge. Both RODOLFO and Pedro Bernaldez admitted in open court that they had "no quarrel with each other," as their families were close-knit.[13]

As to Melita Sasota's testimony that MARIA TERESA attended her class on 29 August 1990, the trial court ruled that, as buttressed by a long line of decisions, the specific date of commission of the offense was not so material for as long as evidence could show that accused had actually committed the offense; and that the accused could be convicted even if there was a mistake as to the date of the commission of the offense as long as the evidence showed with sufficient clarity that a crime was committed and the accused was responsible therefor.

Finally, the trial court gave weight to the medical certificate (Exhibit "B") issued on 3 September 1990 by Dr. De la Paz, who was a government doctor at the time. In considering the medical certificate despite the failure of Dr. De la Paz to testify thereon, the trial court reasoned that such document, being an act done by a public officer, was presumed to be done regularly unless proved otherwise. It concluded that the finding of "[o]ld lacerations at 3:00 and 9 o'clock" and "newly-healed lacerations at 11 o'clock" on the hymen of MARIA TERESA proved that someone had carnal knowledge of her. Nevertheless, a medical examination was not an indispensable requisite in the prosecution for rape.

In view of the penalty imposed, appeal from the decision should have been to this Court.[14] But RODOLFO's appeal was to the Court of Appeals;[15] hence, the record of the case was transmitted to that court.[16] On 23 April 1993, the record of the case was forwarded to this Court.[17]

It was only on 27 March 1996 that RODOLFO's counsel, Atty. Mario Abella Encinareal, filed the Appellant's Brief. He did so only after he had been fined twice in the amounts of P500 and P1,000, and ordered arrested and confined in the cell of the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI).

In his Appellant's Brief, RODOLFO contends that the trial court committed serious and grave error in convicting him of the crime of "multiple rape," which was not charged in the information. He also attacks the ruling of the trial court that the specific date of commission of the offense was not so material so long as evidence could show that the accused had actually committed the offense. According to him, "while the precise time of the commission of the crime need not be alleged in the complaint or information, nevertheless, it must be sufficiently definite and certain to give the accused an opportunity to prepare for his defense"; for unless the accused is informed of the day, or about the day, he may be, to an extent, deprived of the opportunity to defend himself.[18]

RODOLFO likewise argues that he could not have sexually abused MARIA TERESA on 29 August 1990 because (a) he was at his place of work from as early as 6:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.; and (b) MARIA TERESA attended her classes the whole day of 29 August 1990, from 7:15 a.m. until the dismissal of classes in the afternoon. Moreover, MARIA TERESA imputed the crime of rape against him just to escape from more severe beatings from her father for her refusal to obey an errand.

On the other hand, the OSG maintains that RODOLFO was convicted of rape committed on 29 August 1990, and not of multiple rape. His conviction was supported by the straightforward and candid testimony of MARIA TERESA on the details of the rape. The motive imputed to MARIA TERESA is flimsy, illogical, and irrational; and so is the insinuation that the case was filed against RODOLFO to cover up the alleged infidelity of his sister-in-law (MARIA TERESA's mother).

The appeal is without merit.

RODOLFO was not convicted of multiple rape, but of one rape committed on 29 August 1990, as alleged in the information. This is very clear from the following finding of the trial court:

The prosecution, as can be observed, tried to convey to the court that the victim Maria Teresa Bernaldez ha[d] been repeatedly abused by the accused, her uncle and brother of his father, repeatedly for the past five (5) years the latest of which was on the faithful [sic] morning of August 29, 1990. No evidence, however, was presented by the prosecution on how and when Maria Teresa was abused the past five (5) years except that of August 29, 1990.[19]

and the dispositive portion of the decision, which reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the Court finds the accused RODOLFO BERNALDEZ alias DOLFO, GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of Rape. Accordingly, he is hereby sentenced to suffer the penalty of Reclusion Perpetua together with the accessory penalties provided for by law, and to pay the aggrieved party P50,000.00 representing moral and exemplary damages, and to pay the costs.[20]

As to RODOLFO's lament on the trial court's statement that the specific date of the commission of the offense charged in the information is not material, it is enough to quote Section 11 of Rule 110 of the Rules of Court; thus:

SEC. 11. Time of the commission of the offense. - It is not necessary to state in the complaint or information the precise time at which the offense was committed except when the time is a material ingredient of the offense, but the act may be alleged to have been committed at any time as near to the actual date at which the offense was committed as the information or complaint will permit.

Indeed, we have ruled that the precise time of the commission of the crime is not an essential element of rape.[21]

In this case, the allegation in the information of the time of the commission of the offense is specific, i.e., "in the morning of 29 August 1990." RODOLFO admits its sufficiency when he states:

A careful reading of the information clearly show[s] that accused-appellant was charged of [sic] having committed the crime of rape on August 29, 1990, a precise designation of the commission of the crime as determined by the Public Prosecutor. The plain and clear meaning of August 29, 1990, only embraces a period of twenty four (24) hours when used with respect to time....

In fact, at no time before the trial court did the defense question the sufficiency of the information.

Even granting *arguendo* that the prosecution failed to prove the allegation in the information that the rape was committed "in the morning of August 29, 1990," any variance in the evidence as to the time the crime was committed is insignificant, if not, irrelevant. Besides, the record fails to reveal that RODOLFO objected to the testimony of MARIA TERESA as to the time of the commission of the crime. His counsel did not even object to the questions as to the number of times RODOLFO had been abusing MARIA TERESA.[22]

It is settled that even a variance of a few months between the time set out in the indictment and that established by the evidence during trial has been held not to constitute an error so serious as to warrant reversal of a conviction solely on that score.[23] The failure of the complainant to state the exact date and time of the commission of rape is a minor matter and can be expected when the witness is recounting the details of a humiliating experience which are painful and difficult to recall in open court and in the presence of other people.[24] Moreover, the date of the commission of the rape is not an essential element of the crime.[25]

The ruling in *U.S. v. Dichao*[26] cited by RODOLFO is not applicable because the statement of the time of the

commission of the offense in the information (between October 1910 to August 1912) was indefinite and uncertain and was, therefore, held to be fatally defective because it deprived the accused of the opportunity to adequately prepare for his defense.

We now proceed to the central issue of this case: whether RODOLFO is guilty of the crime charged.

We reiterate these guiding principles in reviewing rape cases: (1) an accusation for rape can be made with facility; it is difficult to prove but more difficult for the person accused, though innocent, to disprove; (2) in view of the intrinsic nature of the crime of rape where only two persons are usually involved, the testimony of the complainant must be scrutinized with extreme caution; and (3) the evidence for the prosecution must stand or fall on its own merits and cannot be allowed to draw strength from the weakness of the evidence for the defense.[27] What is decisive in a rape charge is the complainant's positive identification of the accused as the malefactor.[28] Bare denial and alibi are insufficient to overcome the positive identification made by the prosecution witness.[29]

In this case, MARIA TERESA, a 10-year-old Grade III pupil,[30] positively identified RODOLFO as the person who raped her on 29 August 1990,[31] and who had been sexually abusing her "many times" since she was 5 years old. She testified as follows:

[PROSECUTOR BIRATA]:

Q On August 29, 1990, do you remember if you were in the house of your Uncle, Rodolfo Bernaldez?

[WITNESS]:

A Yes, sir.

Q The house of your uncle, Rodolfo Bernaldez, is in Barangay Sugcad, Polangui, Albay, is that correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q While you were there in the house of your uncle on August 29, 1990, what did Rodolfo Bernaldez, your uncle do to you?

ATTY. ENCINAREAL: No basis, Your Honor.

PROSECUTOR BIRATA:

Q What happened?

Witness:

A He was removing my clothes.

Q After he removed you clothes, what happened?

A He was inserting his penis to my vagina.

ATTY. ENCINAREAL: Objection, Your Honor.

COURT: Continue.

PROSECUTOR BIRATA:

Q In what part of the house did he actually put his penis to your vagina?

A Upstairs.

Q When your uncle was doing that to you, were there other people?

A None.

COURT:

Q When your uncle inserted his penis to your vagina, what happened?

WITNESS:

A Something came out from his organ.

Q What is that something?

A Something which is sticky.

PROSECUTOR BIRATA:

Q How many times have your uncle done this to you?

WITNESS:

A Many times.[32]

She affirmed the sworn statements which she gave to the police:

PROSECUTOR BIRATA:

Q Now I am going to read to you the question and answer No. 8. “Kung ikaw ba inaabuso ng iyong tiyuhin na si Rodolfo Bernaldez ano naman ang ginagawa sa iyo.” Answer. “Ako po ay kanyang binubuhay patungo sa itaas ng kanyang bahay at doon niya ako hinuhubaran ng panti at ako kanyang ipinapahihiga sa sahig ng kanyang bahay at habang ako ay nakahiga siya naman ay binababa ang kanyang siper ng kanyang pantalon at inilalabas ang kanyang titi at dahandahan ito pinapasok sa akong kiki at doon ay humihindayog na pababa at paitaas ang kanyang poit hanggang sa doon mayroong lumalabas na mainit na galing sa kanyang titi.” Do you remember having [been] asked that question and having [given] the same answer to that question?

WITNESS:

A Yes, sir.[33]

During the cross-examination, MARIA TERESA asserted that the answers in her sworn statement were given by her, not by the police investigator.[34]

Against this story of MARIA TERESA, RODOLFO had nothing but alibi. For the defense of alibi to prosper, the requirements of time and place must be strictly met. It is not enough to prove that the accused was somewhere else when the crime was committed; he must also demonstrate that it was physically impossible for him to have been at the crime scene at the time the crime was committed.[35]

Initially, there is some surface appeal on the proffered alibi because according to RODOLFO and his witness Delfin Paular, he was out of his house the whole day of 29 August 1990, from 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Also, Melita Sasota testified that on the basis of her school record, MARIA TERESA was in her class the whole day of 29 August 1990. However, their testimonies have not convincingly proved that MARIA TERESA never went to RODOLFO's house on 29 August 1990 and that it was physically impossible for RODOLFO to have been in his house when the rape was committed.

Sasota admitted that she did not know where MARIA TERESA went after the morning session, much less after the dismissal of her class in the afternoon.[36] Moreover, we entertain serious doubt as to the reliability of Sasota's record (Exhibit “2”) and her testimony regarding MARIA TERESA's attendance and presence in school throughout the whole day of 29 August 1990. First, Pedro Bernaldez declared that on that day MARIA TERESA did not go to school; she was in their house when he left for work and when he came home.[37] Second, and more

significantly, for 1 March 1991, Sasota's school record of attendance did not show that MARIA TERESA was absent or tardy on that day. Yet, on that date, MARIA TERESA was in court and testified in the rape case.

Delfin Paular's testimony does not inspire belief either. He admitted that he did not actually keep a record of the day-to-day list of personnel working for Mr. Cu because somebody was assigned to do it, and that he was only an "overseer." [38] He also revealed that RODOLFO was not in the list of personnel because he was only a substitute for his brother Pedro Bernaldez, who was the one listed as employee of the rice mill. [39] Obviously, his testimony was contrived for the alibi of RODOLFO.

Moreover, RODOLFO's house was only about 2 ½ to 3 kilometers away from his place of work and could be reached in 30 minutes by walking. [40] Thus, even if indeed he went to work on 29 August 1990, it was not physically impossible for him to have been at his house where the rape was committed.

RODOLFO's belated theory that MARIA TERESA fabricated the charge of rape to stop her father from further beating her for her refusal to go to RODOLFO's house to borrow money is incredible. For one, it was never shown that MARIA TERESA had been known to be a liar or a disobedient child. If she refused to go to the house of RODOLFO, it must have been for a compelling reason. Her having been raped by him was, by any measure, an overwhelming compelling reason not to go to RODOLFO's house. For another, it is unthinkable that MARIA TERESA, a girl of tender age, inexperienced in the ways of the world, would concoct a tale of defloration by no less than an uncle just to avoid further beatings from her father.

MARIA TERESA's statements before the police and her testimony on the rape incident contained delicate details which could be given by her alone and could only be based on real experience rather than on imagination. Surely, from the time she first disclosed the rape, that is, in the morning of 30 August 1990, until she gave her statements to the police on 2 September 1990 and appeared before the municipal trial court judge, she had sufficient time to reflect on the seriousness of the charge. Several months later, she affirmed in court the same allegations of rape. We cannot discern any plausible reason for her to falsely accuse her uncle of so grave a wrong unless it was the truth.

The prevailing rule is that the testimony of rape victims who are young and immature deserves full credence. [41] Indeed, "no woman, especially of tender age, would concoct a story of defloration, allow an examination of her private parts, and thereafter pervert herself by being subjected to a public trial if she was not motivated solely by the desire to have the culprit apprehended and punished." [42]

Curiously, the alleged ill-motive on the part of MARIA TERESA was not the motive RODOLFO disclosed in his testimony. What he told the court was that the case was filed to stop him from revealing to the public the alleged incident showing that MARIA TERESA's mother had an illicit affair with her neighbor, a certain Rodolfo. RODOLFO, however, abandoned this claim, for he must have realized that it was too incredible. Pedro Bernaldez would unlikely sacrifice the honor and reputation of his family and the future of his young daughter, and implicate his brother to whom he usually ran for economic support just to cover up the alleged incident involving his wife. Neither would he use her daughter as an engine of malice, especially if by doing so her daughter would be subjected to embarrassment and even life-long stigma. [43] Then, too, it is hard to believe that a rape victim, like MARIA TERESA, and her family would publicly disclose the rape incident and thus sully their honor and reputation in the community unless it was true. [44]

The trial court erred in giving weight to the medical certificate issued by Dr. De la Paz despite the failure of the latter to testify. The certificate could be admitted as an exception to the hearsay rule. [45] However, since it involved an opinion of one who must first be established as an expert witness, [46] it could not be given weight or credit unless the doctor who issued it be presented in court to show his qualifications. Here, a distinction must be

made between admissibility of evidence and probative value thereof. Nevertheless, a medical examination is not indispensable in a prosecution for rape.[47] The lone testimony of the victim is sufficient if credible.

Finally, it was unnecessary for the trial court to consider the issue of force or intimidation. Since MARIA TERESA was undisputedly below 12 years old on 29 August 1990, when the rape was committed, then any carnal knowledge of her, even if consented, would be rape under the third paragraph of Article 335 of the Revised Penal Code. Said article pertinently provides:

ART. 335. When and how rape is committed. – Rape is committed by having carnal knowledge of a woman under any of the following circumstances:

3. When the woman is under twelve years of age, even though neither of the circumstances mentioned in the two preceding paragraphs shall be present.

Per current case law, a rape victim is entitled to an indemnity of P50,000.[48] She can also recover moral damages pursuant to Article 2219, and exemplary damages if the commission of the crime was attended by one or more aggravating circumstances pursuant to Article 2230, both of the Civil Code. No aggravating circumstance was proved in this case; hence, the trial court's award of exemplary damages is incorrect. Under the circumstances in this case, we deem fit to award the complainant an indemnity of P50,000 and moral damages in the amount of P50,000.

WHEREFORE, the 19 January 1993 Decision of Branch 14 of the Regional Trial Court of Ligao, Albay, in Criminal Case No. 2763 finding RODOLFO BERNALDEZ, alias "Dolfo," guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of rape, and sentencing him to suffer the penalty of reclusion perpetua is AFFIRMED with the modification ordering him to pay the victim civil indemnity of P50,000 and moral damages of P50,000.

Costs against accused-appellant.

SO ORDERED.

Bellosillo, Vitug, Panganiban and Quisumbing, JJ., concur.

[1] Original Record (OR), Criminal Case No. 2763, 151-157; Rollo, 16-22. Per Acting Presiding Judge Romulo SG. Villanueva.

[2] Also spelled as Theresa in the criminal complaint and information.

[3] OR, 1.3 for rape was filed before the 6th Municipal Circuit Trial Court (MCTC) of Polangui-Libon, Albay, on

[4] OR, 9-10.

[5] Id., 11.

[6] Id., 22.

[7] The Subpoena of 5 March 1991 issued to Dr. Ma. Nancy de la Paz requiring her to appear in court and testify on 3 April 1991 was returned unserved because she had already resigned from the Pio Duran District Memorial Hospital as early as January 1991.(OR, 42-A).

[8] Appellee's Brief, 5-8; Rollo, 177-180.

[9] TSN, 12 November 1991, 4-6.

[10] Id., 6-9; 20-21.

[11] TSN, 27 August 1991, 5-7.

[12] TSN, 17 September 1992, 3-7.

[13] RTC Decision, 5; OR, 155; Rollo, 20.

[14] Sec. 17, Judiciary Act of 1948, as amended; Sec. 3(c), Rule 122, Rules of Court.

[15] OR, 158.

[16] Id., 162.

[17] Rollo, 1.

[18] Citing U.S. v. Dichao, 27 Phil. 421 [1914].

[19] RTC Decision, 4; OR, 154; Rollo, 19. Underscoring supplied for emphasis.

[20] Rollo, 21-22.

[21] People v. Molero, 144 SCRA 397, 406 [1986] , citing People v. Borromeo, 123 SCRA 253 [1993], differentiating the cases of People v. Rivera, 33 SCRA 746 [1970] and U.S. v. Dichao, 27 Phil. 420, 423 [1914] .

[22] TSN, 1 March 1991, 7.

[23] Rocaberte v. People, 193 SCRA 152, 156 [1991] . Citing 4 MORAN, COMMENTS ON THE RULES OF COURT 38 [1980] and the cases cited therein; and GUPIT, RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 74-75 [1986] .

[24] People v. Bugarin, 273 SCRA 384, 397 [1997] .

[25] People v. Quiñones, 222 SCRA 249, 254 [1993] .

[26] 27 Phil. 421 [1914] .

[27] People v. De los Reyes, 203 SCRA 707, 727 [1991]; People v. Tismo, 204 SCRA 535, 552 [1991] ; People v. Casinillo, 213 SCRA 777, 788-789 [1992], People v. Matrimonio, 215 SCRA 613, 627 [1992] ; People v. Lucas, 232 SCRA 537, 546 [1994]. People v. Excija, 258 SCRA 424, 438-439 [1996]. People v. De Guzman, 265 SCRA 228, 241 [1996] .

[28] People v. Esquila, 254 SCRA 140, 146 [1996] .

[29] People v. Nazareno, 260 SCRA 256, 282 [1996] .

[30] Certificate of Live Birth (Exhibit C); OR, 3.

[31] TSN, 1 March 1991, 5.

[32] TSN, 1 March 1991, 6-7.

[33] Id., 11.

[34] TSN, 1 March 1991, 15.

[35] People v. Maqueda, 242 SCRA 565, 592 [1995] .

[36] TSN, 17 September 1992, 5-6.

[37] TSN, 1 March 1991, 23-25.

[38] TSN, 27 August 1992, 10.

[39] TSN, 27 August 1992, 11.

[40] TSN, 12 November 1991, 4-5.

[41] *People v. Galimba*, 253 SCRA 722, 728 [1996] .

[42] *People v. Derpo*, 168 SCRA 447, 457 [1988] ; *People v. Magpayo*, 266 SCRA 13 [1993] .

[43] *People v. Alimon*, 257 SCRA 658, 670 [1996] .

[44] *People v. Namayan*, 246 SCRA 646, 656 [1995] .

[45] Sec. 44 Rule 130, Rules of Court.

[46] Sec. 49, Rule 130, Rules of Court.

[47] *People v. Saldivia*, 203 SCRA 461, 472 [1991] ; *People v. Rostata, Jr.*, 218 SCRA 657, 676 [1993] , *People v. Gapasan*, 243 SCRA 53, 60 [1995] .

[48] However, if the crime of rape is committed or effectively qualified by any of the circumstances under which the death penalty is authorized by the present amended law, the indemnity for the victim shall be not less than P75,000.00. (*People v. Victor*, G.R. No. 127903, 9 July 1998).

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.