

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, APPELLEE, VS. ANTONIO GUIHAMA Y BARANDA, APPELLANT.

G.R. No. 126113. June 25, 2003

Ponente: AZCUNA, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-126113/>

AZCUNA, J.:

This is an appeal from the decision[1] of the Regional Trial Court of Pangasinan, Branch 38, in Criminal Case No. 40460, entitled "People of the Philippines v. Antonio Guihama y Baranda." The trial court found appellant guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of rape with homicide committed against his sister-in-law, AAA.[2]

On May 14, 1993, an information was filed against appellant as follows:[3]

That on or about the 27[th] day of March, 1993, in the City of Iloilo, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Court, said accused, armed with a knife, by means of violence and intimidation, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously have carnal knowledge of AAA against her will, and by reason or on occasion thereof, with intent to kill, hit and wound AAA with the knife he was then provided at the time, thus causing upon said AAA various injuries on the vital parts of her body which caused her death.

Appellant pleaded not guilty to the information and trial ensued.[4]

The Prosecution's Evidence

A total of ten witnesses were presented by the prosecution, namely: xxxxxxxxxxxx, Mary Ann Aranas, Dr. Tito Doromal, Fernando Jaculina, and police officers Andres Magnitico, Evan Deramas, Rene Lauron, Cornelio Lopez and Rely Liza.

xxxxxxxxxxx (xxxxxxxxx) is the older half-sister of AAA (AAA) on her mother's side and is, consequently, also appellant's sister-in-law.[5] xxxxxxxxx testified[6] that on March 27, 1993, at about 6:30 p.m., she was on her way home and walking on top of a dike in San Isidro, Tabuc Suba, Jaro, Iloilo City when she came across her husband and appellant talking with each other. xxxxxxxxx invited her husband and appellant to go home with her. xxxxxxxxx husband went with her while appellant was left behind because, according to him, he was waiting for someone. As they left, appellant made a comment that AAA is very much loved by her mother and laughed out loud as if insinuating something. xxxxxxxxx later asked her husband what they talked about and her husband said that appellant had asked him whether AAA would be going home early.

xxxxxxxxxx house is located just 1 meter away from her mother's house, where AAA was also residing. xxxxxxxxx testified that upon getting home, she and her husband prepared dinner. xxxxxxxxx saw from her house AAA arrive at her mother's house at around 7:00 p.m. However, AAA did not stay long. xxxxxxxxx heard their younger brother tell AAA to go to appellant's house as instructed by their mother, who was already there taking care of appellant's children. xxxxxxxxx then saw AAA leave for appellant's house, which is about 150 meters away from their house.

Later that evening, their mother arrived and asked where AAA was. Their younger brother informed her that AAA had already left. Their mother then assumed that they must have missed each other on the way and that

AAA decided to sleep in the house of appellant.

The following morning, a child came to the house bringing a pair of slippers belonging to AAA. The child said he found the slippers on the pathway near some banana plants. xxxxxxxx felt nervous and immediately went to where the slippers were found. It was then that she discovered the lifeless and naked body of AAA. The victim had multiple wounds on the body and was covered in blood. xxxxxxxx immediately screamed for help.

When investigated by the police, xxxxxxxx declared that she suspected appellant as the assailant because of the comment he made, the day before, about AAA being loved by their mother very much. xxxxxxxx also told the police that AAA and appellant had previously quarreled because appellant kept watching AAA's whereabouts.

xxxxxxxxxx (xxxxxxxxxx), AAA's mother, testified[7] that on March 27, 1993, she went to appellant's house at around 7:00 a.m. to take care of appellant's children and do the housekeeping chores. Appellant and his wife were also in the house with xxxxxxxx. While thereat, appellant requested xxxxxxxx to have AAA come to his house as he and his wife will be eating out. At around 5:00 p.m., xxxxxxxx went to her house to leave a message for AAA, that she should go to appellant's house as soon as she comes home. xxxxxxxx came back to appellant's house at around 5:30 p.m. Appellant was gone by that time.

xxxxxxxxxx went home at around 8:00 p.m. When she got home, she asked her husband why AAA did not go to appellant's house. Her husband answered that AAA had already left.

The following morning, a child came to their house saying that he saw a pair of slippers belonging to AAA. xxxxxxxx instructed xxxxxxxx to go with the child to where he saw the slippers. Moments later she heard xxxxxxxx shouting. xxxxxxxx immediately went to where xxxxxxxx was and saw the body of AAA lying slightly on her belly with no clothing below the waist. She also noticed semen scattered on AAA's buttocks and that her throat was severed. After seeing AAA's body, xxxxxxxx fainted.

xxxxxxxxxx further testified that four days before AAA's death, the latter had complained to her that appellant kept watching or following her at the place where she worked.

Fernando Jaculina (Jaculina) testified[8] that on March 27, 1993, at about 7:30 p.m., while he was on his way home, he saw appellant and AAA together. He observed that appellant was holding the hands of AAA and was pulling and dragging her towards a tomato plantation. He knew appellant and AAA as both were residents of Barangay San Isidro. Although it was already dark, Jaculina said that he was able to identify them because there was light coming from a lamp post 50 meters away. Jaculina said that he did not mind them because he knew that appellant and AAA were in-laws and assumed that they were just having some family problem.

Andres Magnitico (Magnitico) was one of the policemen who first arrived at the crime scene. He testified[9] that on March 28, 1993, at around 7:00 a.m., the police received a report about a cadaver of a woman found in Tabuc Suba, Jaro, Iloilo City. Magnitico, along with Lauron, Deremas and Peciente, immediately proceeded to the reported location of the body.

At the crime scene, the police team first saw the victim's bloodied body with a bloody panty beside it. They surveyed the surrounding areas to look for evidence and found a bloody Batangueño knife about 10 meters away from the body. They also gathered information from people living in the nearby houses and learned that appellant was "interested" in the victim. They thus went to appellant's house, which was just 100 to 150 meters from the crime scene. Only appellant's wife was home, who told them that appellant left early that morning to drive a jeepney.

A search for appellant then commenced. Checkpoints were set up, but these yielded negative results. The

policemen then decided to return to appellant's house. Upon reaching the house, the policemen noticed for the first time blood on the stairways that had already dried up. They also found appellant already inside the house with his left hand bandaged. The policemen asked him if he could help them identify the assailant of his sister-in-law. When appellant refused to cooperate, they "invited" him to the police headquarters.

At the police headquarters, the policemen questioned appellant about his injured hand. Appellant answered that his hand was struck by the hood of a jeepney he was driving. Police Officer Cornelio Lopez then took over in the interrogation. It was to him that appellant admitted killing the victim. Having obtained an oral confession, the policemen and appellant returned to the latter's house where appellant surrendered a bloody kitchen knife, his pair of bloody slippers and his brief.

Magnitico's fellow policemen, Evan Deramas and Rene Lauron, corroborated his testimony.[10]

Cornelio Lopez (Lopez) took the witness stand and testified[11] that appellant had confessed to him that he killed AAA. Thereafter, he asked appellant about the murder weapon and appellant said that it was in his house. Because of appellant's confession he sent a team of policemen to the house of appellant. When the policemen came back, they brought with them a bloody knife, a brief and a pair of slippers. Upon being shown these items, appellant confirmed that the kitchen knife was the weapon he used in killing AAA and that the brief and slippers were what he wore when he committed the crime.

Rely Liza was presented by the prosecution simply to identify a police blotter which contained two entries: xxxxxxxxx report of the crime to the police and the arrest of appellant.[12]

Mary Ann Aranas (Aranas) a forensic chemist of the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI) testified[13] that her office received an endorsement from the Jaro Police Station in Iloilo City, requesting a blood typing of the blood found on the recovered panty, fan knife, brief, kitchen knife and slippers. Aranas said that the test conducted on the panty, fan knife and slippers showed that the blood found thereon was human, while the brief and kitchen knife proved positive for the presence of blood, but due to the insufficiency of the sample, it could not be determined if it was human or not.

In addition, Aranas testified that the NBI also received from the Jaro Police Station specimen taken from the victim's vagina and fingernails. The specimen tested positive for the presence of seminal stains and human tissues.

Dr. Tito Doromal testified[14] that he conducted the autopsy on AAA's body at 10:45 a.m. on March 28, 1993. His findings were that AAA died of asphyxia by suffocation, secondary to stab wounds. He also placed the time of death at around 14 to 16 hours prior to the autopsy.

The Defense's Evidence

Appellant anchors his defense on denial and alibi. In his testimony,[15] appellant claimed that on March 27, 1993, he was on his way home with Romeo Baterna whom he met at the Jaro Plaza. Romeo Baterna accompanied appellant to his house because the former wanted to borrow appellant's jeepney the following week and needed to know where appellant lives. Along the way, near the small market, they met Hipolito Villegas. Appellant and Romeo Baterna arrived in appellant's house at about 7:00 a.m. Romeo Baterna stayed only for a few minutes and then left, while appellant stayed home and never left until 5:00 a.m. the next morning.

Appellant stated that at 5:00 a.m., he went to his father's house to drive his jeepney. While trying to start the engine appellant saw a loose bolt and tried to tighten it. His finger hit a sharp object in the process and was injured. Because of the wound, he decided not to drive anymore and instead went to the hospital for treatment. From the hospital, appellant headed home.

Appellant recalled arriving home by 10:00 a.m. While resting thereat, policemen came and began searching the house. One of the policemen told him that he was being arrested. Appellant said that the policemen took something from his house but could not tell what it was because it was wrapped. After the search, he was brought to the police station.

Appellant denied committing the crime charged. He also denied having met xxxxxxxx and her husband in the evening of March 27, 1993 and that he orally confessed to the police. He also asserted that Jaculina's testimony, that he was seen pulling and dragging AAA, is a mere fabrication. Appellant further claimed that his wife's family resents him because they think he is lazy and a lowly jeepney driver, while his wife is an educated person.

Elnora Cahilig[16] Guihama (Nene),[17] wife of appellant, testified[18] that on March 27, 1993, appellant left the house at 5:00 a.m. and returned at around 2:00 p.m. After resting for an hour, appellant departed for the repair shop where his jeepney was being repaired. Appellant returned at 5:00 p.m. At 5:30 p.m., Nene's mother arrived. Shortly after that, appellant went out again. At around past 7:00 p.m., Nene's mother went home. After a while, appellant returned, this time accompanied by Romeo Baterna. Romeo Baterna left a few minutes later, while appellant stayed home and did not leave anymore.

Nene said that appellant left the house the next morning at around 5:00 a.m. to drive his jeepney. At around 7:00 a.m., she received information that AAA had died. Later, her sister and brother-in-law came to their house looking for appellant. Policemen came afterwards also looking for appellant. Nene claimed that the policemen went to the kitchen and took a knife and a brief.

Nene also testified that her family does not like appellant and objected to their marriage.

Hipolito Guihama Villegas testified[19] that he came across appellant on March 27, 1993 at around 6:30 p.m. in the market place. He said appellant had a companion whom he did not recognize. He further declared that he was also with appellant the following day when appellant injured his finger while testing the motor of his jeepney.

Romeo Baterna in his testimony[20] corroborated appellant's claim that he accompanied appellant to his house on March 27, 1993.

After considering all the evidence presented, the trial court found appellant guilty in the aforementioned decision that has the following dispositive portion:[21]

WHEREFORE, the court finds the accused, Antonio Guihama y Baranda, guilty beyond reasonable doubt for the crime of Rape with Homicide penalized under Article 335 of the Revised Penal Code as amended and sentences him to suffer a penalty of Reclusion Perpetua and to pay the heirs of AAA the sum of P6,800.00 as actual damages and P50,000.00 as civil indemnity by reason of her death.

The Court's Ruling

Appellant's conviction was based on circumstantial evidence. The trial court barred the admissibility of appellant's alleged oral confession as well as the evidence said to have been recovered in his house, i.e., the bloody kitchen knife, brief and slippers, declaring all of these to have been obtained in violation of the constitutional rights of appellant. Regardless of said exclusion, however, the trial court found enough circumstantial evidence to prove beyond reasonable doubt the guilt of appellant.

The appeal rests largely on appellant's contention that the alleged circumstantial evidence is insufficient to convict him. Appellant primarily targets the testimonies of xxxxxxxx and Jaculina, claiming that these were inconsistent and not in conformity with normal human reaction and experience.

Appellant specifically raises two arguments against the testimony of xxxxxxxx. The first is that, while xxxxxxxx

testified that she saw appellant on the dike at around 6:30 p.m. on March 27, 1993 waiting for someone, it was not disclosed who appellant was waiting for. Hence, it cannot be concluded that appellant was waiting for the victim. The second argument is directed at xxxxxxxx credibility. Appellant contends that xxxxxxxx testimony, declaring that she suspected appellant from the beginning, is inconsistent with her report to the police wherein, instead of mentioning the name of appellant as a suspect, she stated that AAA was raped by a unknown person or persons.[22]

Both arguments are ineffective. The first is erroneous because the trial court, in the first place, did not draw any conclusion from the testimony of xxxxxxxx that appellant waited for AAA at the dike. The testimony of xxxxxxxx was simply to establish the presence of appellant at the dike at that particular time, and nothing more. As to the second argument, xxxxxxxx failure to implicate appellant in her initial report to the police should not be taken against her. xxxxxxxx was not an eyewitness to the crime and suspected appellant only because of their conversation on the dike. Consequently, she could not be expected to accuse appellant before the police.

Appellant contends that Jaculina's testimony is fabricated, based on the following reasons:

- Jaculina said that when he saw appellant dragging and pulling AAA there were several houses nearby. Thus, it is highly improbable that appellant would commit a crime in such a populated area.
- Jaculina testified that the nearest light post from where he, appellant and AAA were situated was about 50 meters away. Thus, there was no sufficient lighting for him actually to see appellant and AAA.
- Assuming Jaculina did witness appellant pulling and dragging AAA, it is contrary to human experience for Jaculina not to report immediately the incident to the family of AAA who lived nearby.
- After learning that AAA had been raped and killed, Jaculina did not immediately report to the police what he saw that night.

We are not convinced by these reasons.

The presence of several houses near the place where Jaculina saw appellant pulling and dragging AAA is no indication that said incident never happened. We have held, time and again, that rape can be committed even in places where people congregate, in parks, along the roadside, in school premises, in a house where there are other occupants, in the same room where other members of the family are also sleeping and even in places which to many would appear unlikely and high risk venues for its commission. Lust is no respecter of time and place.[23] Indeed, the mere fact that AAA had been raped and killed in such a location without anyone knowing about it until the next day is enough to disprove appellant's point.

Neither are we persuaded by the argument that there was not enough lighting for Jaculina to effectively see appellant pulling and dragging AAA because the nearest lamp post was 50 meters away. Jaculina testified that he was only 5 meters away from appellant and AAA. From that distance, and facilitated by the fact that the witness was already acquainted with appellant and AAA, there would have been no difficulty in identifying the two. Once a person has gained familiarity with another, identification becomes quite an easy task even from a considerable distance.[24]

Jaculina's failure immediately to inform the family of AAA about the incident he witnessed was adequately explained. Knowing that the two were in-laws, Jaculina assumed that he witnessed a mere family problem and deemed it best not to get involved. His delay in reporting the incident to the police is also understandable. The initial reluctance of witnesses and their willingness to be involved in criminal investigations are common and have been declared not to affect credibility.[25] Moreover, contrary to appellant's claim that it was months after the incident that Jaculina came out in the open, records show that Jaculina's sworn statement[26] was submitted to

the Office of the City Prosecutor for Iloilo City just two weeks after the incident.

In the end the rule is settled that where the culpability or innocence of the accused hinges on the credibility of the witnesses and the veracity of their testimonies, the findings of trial courts are given the highest degree of respect. Hence, their findings on such matters are binding and conclusive on appellate courts, unless some fact or circumstance of weight and substance has been overlooked, misapprehended or misinterpreted.[27] In the case at bar, none of the above arguments raised by appellant presents any compelling reason for us to disregard the factual findings of the trial court.

Having settled the issues on the credibility of the witnesses, we now determine whether the circumstantial evidence, taken as a whole, is sufficient to convict appellant.

Direct evidence of the commission of a crime is not the only matrix from which a trial court may draw its conclusion and finding of guilt.[28] In rape with homicide, the evidence against the accused is usually circumstantial. The nature of the crime, where only the victim and the rapist would have been around during its commission makes the prosecution of the offense particularly difficult since the victim could no longer testify against the perpetrator. Thus, resorting to circumstantial evidence is almost always inevitable and to demand direct evidence to prove in such instance the modality of the offense and the identity of the perpetrator would be unreasonable.[29]

The rules on evidence and precedents to sustain the conviction of an accused through circumstantial evidence require the presence of the following requisites: 1) there are more than one circumstance; 2) the inference must be based on proven facts; and 3) the combination of all circumstances produces a conviction beyond reasonable doubt of the guilt of the accused.[30]

We have affirmed a number of convictions for rape with homicide based on purely circumstantial evidence. In *People v. Develles*,[31] the body of the victim was found in a river under waist-deep water. Prior to that, the accused therein was seen by witnesses talking to the victim by the river bank. He was also seen holding the victim by the hands, presumably to detain her or prevent her from leaving. The autopsy revealed the victim was raped and killed by a full grown adult and that the time of death was just minutes after the accused and the victim were last seen talking to each other.

In *People v. Magana*,[32] one witness testified that he saw the accused therein strangling the victim. Two other witnesses testified that they also saw the accused very near the place where the victim's body was found looking uneasy, walking back and forth as if waiting for somebody. The autopsy conducted on the victim estimated her time of death to be at about the time the three witnesses saw the accused. Also, the victim's mother testified that her daughter told her one week prior to the incident that the accused would always look at her in a "bad way" whenever they met. We affirmed the conviction of the accused.

In a more recent case entitled *People v. Corfin*,[33] we upheld the conviction of the accused based on the following circumstances: 1) the accused was the last person seen with the victim; 2) said accused and the victim were seen together near the dry creek; 3) the accused was seen leaving said place alone; and 4) the body of the victim was found in the dry creek.

Going back to this case, the trial court enumerated no less than seven pieces of circumstantial evidence against appellant. We quote in full the relevant portion of the assailed decision:

In the instant case, the prosecution was able to prove the following circumstances: First, when xxxxxxxxxx [sic] and her husband left, the accused stayed behind in the irrigation dike purportedly to wait for someone. He commented that the victim is very much loved by her mother and at the same time laughing meaningfully;

second, around 7:30 on the evening, Fernando Jaculina saw the accused holding the hands of the victim while dragging her towards the tomato plantation, the very place where the victim was discovered dead the following morning; third, the blood stains were seen by the police on the very step of the stairs of the house of the accused on the very morning after the discovery of the dead body of the victim; fourth, the accused suffered a wound in his left middle finger; fifth, the recovery of a fan knife belonging to the victim near her cadaver suggesting her vehement and violent resistance on the lustful advance of the accused causing the injury on his left middle finger; sixth, the presence of spermatozoa on the buttocks of the victim as seen by her mother after the discovery of her dead body; seventh, Dr. Tito Doromal opined after the necropsy examination he conducted at 10:45 in the morning of March 28, 1993, that the victim died between 14 to 16 hours before he conducted said examination which time jibes with the time after Fernando Jaculina saw the accused forcibly dragging the victim towards the tomato plantation. Certainly these circumstances as gleaned from herein factual findings form an unbroken chain which had a fair and reasonable conclusion pointing to the accused as the perpetrator of the crime. Hence, even disregarding the accused oral confession and consequent discovery of the physical evidence, still the prosecution was able to show the guilt of the accused for the crime charged by means of proof beyond reasonable doubt.[34]

Considering all the circumstances mentioned and in light of previous rulings, we are satisfied that the evidence adduced against appellant constitutes an unbroken chain leading to the one fair and reasonable conclusion that appellant was the perpetrator of the crime.

It is doctrinal that the requirement of proof beyond reasonable doubt in criminal law does not mean such a degree of proof as to exclude the possibility of error and produce absolute certainty. Only moral certainty is required or that degree of proof which produces conviction in an unprejudiced mind.[35] This was sufficiently established in the case at bar.

Appellant's defense of denial and alibi should be rejected. Alibi is generally considered a weak defense because of the facility with which it can be fabricated. Thus, courts have always looked upon it with suspicion and have received it with caution. For alibi to prevail, the defense must establish by positive, clear and satisfactory proof that it was physically impossible for the accused to have been at the scene of the crime at the time of its commission, and not merely that the accused was somewhere else.[36]

The crime was approximated to have been committed between 6:45 p.m. and 8:45 p.m. of March 27, 1993. Appellant stated he was inside his house on March 27, 1993 from 7:00 p.m. until 5:00 a.m. the next day. Appellant's house was a mere 150 meters away from the place of the incident. Prior to that, appellant said he was just walking around Tabuc Suba, Jaro, Iloilo City. Clearly, the alleged whereabouts of appellant do not make it impossible for him to be in the place of the incident at the probable time of death.

Appellant's defense of alibi, therefore, fails. Furthermore, it cannot overcome the positive identification made by Jaculina of appellant pulling and dragging the victim that fatal night.[37]

We now address the civil liability imposed by the trial court.

The victim's mother, xxxxxxxxx, testified that she spent a total of P6,800 for burial expenses which were supported by receipts.[38] xxxxxxxxx also presented an itemized list of other burial expenses totaling P23,320.[39] The trial court awarded only P6,800 as actual damages on the ground that they were the only ones duly supported with receipts. Ordinarily, receipts should support claims of actual damages, but where the defense did not contest the claim, it should also be granted.[40]

We also award damages for loss of earning capacity using the formula laid out in *People v. Garcia, et al.*, as follows:[41]

Age of Victim

=

21 years old

Life Expectancy

=

$\frac{2}{3}$ (80 - age of victim at the time of death)

=

39.33

Gross Annual Income

=

P12,000[42]

Living Expenses

=

50% of Gross Annual Income

Loss of Earning

=

Life Expectancy x (Gross Annual Capacity Income - Living Expenses)

=

P236,000

Furthermore, in line with current jurisprudence, we should increase the award of civil indemnity to P100,000 and award moral damages in the amount of P50,000.[43]

The services of a private attorney were also secured to prosecute the case for a fee of P25,000.[44] We deem it just and equitable that said amount be likewise recovered by the victim's heirs under Article 2208 (11) of the Civil Code.

WHEREFORE, the assailed decision of the Regional Trial Court of Iloilo City, Branch 38, in Criminal Case No. 40460 is hereby **AFFIRMED**, with modifications as to the damages awarded. Appellant is ordered to pay the heirs of the victim P30,120 as actual damages, P236,000 as loss of earning capacity, P100,000 as civil indemnity, P50,000 as moral damages and P25,000 as attorney's fees.

Costs de oficio.

SO ORDERED.

Davide, Jr., C.J., (Chairman), Vitug, Ynares-Santiago, and Carpio, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, p. 52.

[2] The records also refer to the victim as "Merle".

[3] Rollo, p. 10.

[4] Certificate of Arraignment, Records, p. 10; Order dated June 7, 1993, Records, p. 13.

[5] TSN, February 14, 1995, p. 23.

[6] Id., pp. 3-14.

[7] TSN, March 7, 1995, pp. 4-12.

[8] TSN, November 25, 1994, pp. 3-7.

[9] TSN, August 22, 1994, pp. 4-16.

[10] Decision, p. 4; Rollo, p. 36.

[11] TSN, December 19, 1994, pp. 4-7.

[12] TSN, January 23, 1995, p. 8.

[13] TSN, July 5, 1993, pp. 4-17.

[14] TSN, July 30, 1993, pp. 11-13.

[15] TSN, August 18, 1995, pp. 5-29.

[16] "Cajilig" in the TSN.

[17] Nickname given by her mother, TSN, March 7, 1995, p. 20.

[18] TSN, June 5, 1995, pp 4-19.

[19] TSN, June 16, 1995, pp. 3-15.

[20] TSN, August 21, 1995, pp. 5-10.

[21] Rollo, pp. 50-51.

- [22] Police blotter, Exhibit T and 1, Records, p. 409.
- [23] *People v. Estomaca*, G.R. Nos. 134288-89, January 15, 2002.
- [24] *People v. Reyes*, 309 SCRA 672 (1999).
- [25] *People v. Competente*, 207 SCRA 591 (1992).
- [26] Exhibit S, Records, p. 408.
- [27] *People v. Basquez*, G.R. No. 144035, September 27, 2001; *People v. Jaberto*, 307 SCRA 93 (1999); *People v. Deleverio*, 289 SCRA 547 (1998).
- [28] *People v. Gallarde*, 325 SCRA 835 (2000).
- [29] *People v. Rayos*, 351 SCRA 336 (2001).
- [30] *People v. Mendez*, G.R. No. 147671, November 21, 2002.

[31] 208 SCRA 101 (1992).

[32] 259 SCRA 380 (1996).

- [33] G.R. No. 131478, April 11, 2002.
- [34] Decision, Rollo, p. 48.
- [35] *People vs. Guarnes*, 160 SCRA 522 (1988).
- [36] *People v. Cortes*, 226 SCRA 91 (1993).
- [37] *People v. Magana*, 259 SCRA 380 (1996).
- [38] Exhibits W and Y, Records, pp. 413-414.
- [39] Exhibit X, Records, p. 415.
- [40] *People v. Arellano*, 334 SCRA 775 (2000).
- [41] G.R. No. 145505, March 14, 2003.
- [42] TSN, March 7, 1995, p. 10.
- [43] *People v. Maguera*, G.R. No. 139906, March 5, 2003.
- [44] TSN, March 7, 1995, p. 15.

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.