

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, APPELLEE, VS. DIOSDADO CORIAL Y REQUIEZ, APPELLANT.

G.R. No. 143125. June 10, 2003

Ponente: VITUG, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-143125/>

VITUG, J.:

For automatic review is the decision of the Regional Trial Court of Pasay City, Branch 109,[1] imposing the death penalty on convicted appellant Diosdado Corial y Requez for the crime of qualified rape,[2] said to have been committed, according to the indictment, against his own minor granddaughter AAA.

At his arraignment, appellant pleaded "not guilty" to the charge;[3] trial ensued shortly thereafter.

The Case for the Prosecution. —

AAA was born to xxxxxxxxxx, appellant's daughter, but she did not come to know her father (now said to be deceased). AAA had two maternal sisters who lived with their mother and her "stepfather" in Balagtas, Bulacan. AAA lived with her grandparents, herein appellant and his wife xxxxxxxxxx, in Pasay City.

One afternoon in July 1998, AAA and appellant were left alone in the house. She was wearing a duster when her grandfather forced himself on her. He first inserted his penis into her private part, and then into her mouth and, finally, into her anus. When her mother, xxxxxxxx, arrived for Christmas in 1998, AAA revealed the sexual abuse she had suffered from her grandfather. AAA went first to the barangay hall where she lodged a complaint against appellant and then to the Philippine General Hospital where AAA was physically examined. Still later, they repaired to the Pasay City Police station where AAA executed a sworn statement (salaysay).

According to barangay captain Policarpio Tawat, xxxxxxxx and AAA went to see him on the morning of 29 December 1998 at the barangay hall to seek assistance about the sexual assault. Along with a barangay kagawad, Tawat went to invite appellant to the barangay hall and then had a medical examination conducted on AAA. When the medical examination proved positive for rape, Tawat turned appellant over to the Pasay City Police station.

The Provisional Medical Certificate,[4] dated 29 December 1998, showed the following findings of Dr. Mariella Sugue-Castillo; viz:

"GENITAL EXAMINATION:

External genitalia: normal

Hymen: crescentic hymen, no discharge seen, (+) mound at 7 o'clock position, (+) attenuation of posterior hymen

Anus: normal findings

"IMPRESSION

Disclosure of sexual abuse.

Genital finding of posterior hymen attenuation is suspicious for prior penetration injury"[5]

On the afternoon of 29 December 1998, SPO3 Milagros Carrasco was at the Women and Children Desk of the Pasay City Police station when Barangay Captain Tawat, xxxxxxxx, young AAA, and xxxxxxxx 's father arrived. After hearing the story, SPO3 Carrasco contacted social worker Erlinda Aguila to assist her in conducting the interview with AAA. The child claimed that her maternal grandfather had sexually abused her. When confronted by SPO3 Carrasco, appellant remarked in Tagalog that he was just having a "taste" of the child (tinitikman niya lang).

The Case for the Defense. —

Testifying for her father, Nelly Corial stated that the 59-year-old appellant had six children, all of them female, by his wife xxxxxxxx . He was a mason and construction worker employed by D. M. Consunji while her mother was a dressmaker. Her father was a responsible person with no vices. Her parents first took custody of AAA because the latter's father, xxxxxxxxxxxx and live-in partner of xxxxxxxxxxxx, would often inflict physical harm upon the child. After xxxxxxxx's death, xxxxxxxx resided in Balagtas, Bulacan, with yet another live-in partner, Rene Malinao, who both for a while took AAA into their custody. AAA was soon brought back to her grandparent's residence in Pasay City because of the maltreatment she had been getting from Malinao. According to Nelly, her parents loved AAA, provided for her needs, and had her take up schooling at the Pio del Pilar Elementary School. After the case against appellant was filed, xxxxxxxx confided to Nelly her regrets (nagsisisi) for having filed the case. xxxxxxxx became "mentally deranged" and would harm herself for no reason at all. She concluded that xxxxxxxx's complaint was fabricated (gawa-gawa lamang niya iyun). Menchu, another daughter of appellant, also testified for him. Her residence in Pasay City was separated from appellant's house only by a wall. She confirmed that AAA was brought to San Pedro, Laguna, at the instance of appellant who had wanted the child to have a vacation there.

Appellant denied having raped AAA. He took the child away from her parents because they were unable to properly care for her. After xxxxxxxx's death, he took custody of xxxxxxxx and her child but only for four months when xxxxxxxx started to live with another partner in Bulacan. xxxxxxxx was a good daughter and a good mother but she was mentally ill and hardheaded (suwail). xxxxxxxx instigated the case against him because he had refused to allow her to live in their house in Pasay City. From Monday to Saturday, he would leave the house at six o'clock in the morning and return from work at seven o'clock in the evening. On Sundays, Nelly would always be at home.

The Assailed Decision. —

The trial court debunked the defense of denial interposed by appellant and the assertion that the rape case was only trumped-up by his daughter xxxxxxxx. It instead gave credence to what it so described as the "spontaneous and straightforward" testimony of AAA. The trial court adjudged:

"In view of all the foregoing, the Court opines that the prosecution has proven the guilt of the accused, Diosdado Corial y Requez for rape as defined and penalized under Art. 266-A and 266-B of RA 8353 as amended, and the Court hereby sentences the accused, Diosdado Corial y Requez to death and to indemnify the complainant in the amount of P75,000.00 and moral and exemplary damages in the amount of P50,000.00." [6]

Appellant, in this Court's review of his case, would consider erroneous his conviction for there was no opportunity

for him and his granddaughter to be alone in their residence, particularly on Sundays when all the members of the household stayed home, and for AAA's failure to make an outcry during the alleged sexual assault that could have easily attracted the attention of close kins whose house was only adjacent to theirs.

Quite often, this Court has held that rapists are not deterred from committing the odious act of sexual abuse by the mere presence nearby of people or even family members. Rape is committed not exclusively in seclusion;^[7] lust, it is said, respects neither time nor place. The trial court has valued AAA's testimony as being "spontaneous and straightforward." Indeed, when a victim's testimony is straightforward and unflawed by any major inconsistency or contradiction, the same must be given full faith and credit.^[8] Appellant capitalizes on the so-called disparity between the declaration of AAA in her testimony in court and her sworn statement. He quotes a portion of her salaysay; viz:

"06. T: Natatandaan mo ba kung kailan at kung saan nangyari ang mga ginawa na sinasabi ng lolo mo sa iyo?

S: Opo, simula po ng Grade II ako. Tapos naulit po nuong July 1998 at nauulit po pag araw ng Linggo pag wala ang lola ko at ang tita ko sa bahay namin. Kasi nagtratrabaho si Lolo ng Lunes hanggang Sabado. Pero pag wala siyang pasok ay ginagalaw din niya ako. Sa bahay namin sa Dolores, Pasay.^[9]

He then labels it as being inconsistent with her testimony on cross-examination; viz:

"Atty. Casas:

Now, it was in July 1998 which is finally the alleged (sic) contained in the information that you claimed you have been sexually molested, is that correct?

"A: Yes, sir.

"Q: And you told the Court in your direct examination that it was the first time that the same was committed?

"A: Yes, sir."^[10]

Not only is her assailed statement — that before the July 1998 incident she has also been subjected to sexual assault by appellant — inconsequential in a material point but it also does not necessarily take away her credibility at the witness stand. It is acknowledged that affidavits, usually taken ex parte, are often held unreliable for being incomplete and inaccurate.^[11]

AAA's failure to shout during the sexual assault is not all that strange. Not every witness to or victim of a crime can be supposed to always act in conformity with the usual expectations of everyone;^[12] in fact, there is no known and accepted standard therefor. Moreover, to attribute to her the sophistication of an adult woman would be to brush aside the fact that AAA is just a young girl. Even then, it would be unreasonable to judge her actions on the traumatic experience by any norm of behavior that, if at all, may be expected from mature persons.^[13]

The Court is not persuaded by the claim of appellant that xxxxxxxx, the victim's mother, has fabricated the charge simply because appellant did not allow her to stay with him. It just is not a convincing tale. It is difficult to believe that xxxxxxxx would send his own father to jail, even to the gallows, sacrifice the honor and dignity of their family and subject her own child to untold humiliation and disgrace if she were motivated by any desire other than to bring to justice the person responsible for defiling her child.^[14]

Appellant's claim that xxxxxxxx is deranged lacks unbiased evidentiary support. In any event, it hardly has any bearing on the credibility of her own daughter. Nor would the failure of the prosecution to present xxxxxxxx at the witness stand adversely affect the outcome of the case. The prosecution is not bound to present any witness other

than the victim herself, for as long as the testimony of the victim is credible, natural, convincing and otherwise consistent with human nature and the course of things,[15] it may be the basis for a conviction. It is the prerogative of the prosecution, not much unlike that of the defense, to determine which evidence to submit in support of its own case.[16]

AAA, on direct examination, testified thusly:

"Q: In the information filed to (sic) this Honorable Court, stated that you are complaining for rape perpetrated by your Lolo Diosdado Corial that happened in July 1998. Do you still recall the date in July when this incident, the alleged incident happened?

"A: It was in July but I do not know or remember the date, sir.

"Q: But could you still recall if that was in the morning or lunch time or evening of July 1998?

"A: It was in the afternoon of July 1998.

"Q: And in what place where this incident happened regarding the complaint (sic) that you were sexually molested by your grandfather Diosdado Corial?

"A: The incident happened at 164 Dolores Street, Pasay City.

"Q: Was it inside your house?

"A: Yes, sir.

"Q:

You earlier stated that the alleged rape happened in the afternoon, sometime in July 1998 inside your house at No. 164 Dolores Street, Pasay City. My question is, who were actually present inside your house when the incident happened?

"A: My grandmother was there, but she left.

"Q: And who was left behind in the afternoon of July 1998 when the incident happened?

"A: I and my grandfather was (sic) left inside the house.

"Q: And what actually were you doing in that afternoon of July 1998 when you were inside your house?

"A: None, sir.

"Q: What were you wearing then?

"A: I was wearing a duster, sir.

"Q:

And so was there any unusual incident that happened in the month of July 1998? When you were left by your Lola inside your house and left with your Lolo?

"A: Yes, there was.

"Q: Would you kindly tell to this Honorable Court, what happened to you on that month of July 1998?

"A: I was raped by my grandfather, sir.

"Q: Will you further explain to this Honorable Court, how were you raped by your grandfather?

"A: He inserted his penis into my private part, sir.

"Q: And what did you feel when your grandfather inserted his penis inside your private part?

"A: I felt pain, sir.

"Fiscal Barrera:

Besides inserting his penis at your private part, what else did your Lolo do to you?

"A:

He was requesting me to suck his penis.

"Q: And did he actually put his penis inside your mouth?

"A: Yes, sir.

"Q: And what happen(ed) after he inserted his penis inside your mouth?

"A: He requested me to suck it, sir.

"Q: And what else happened aside (from) inserting his penis at your private part, and putting his penis inside your mouth sometime in the month of July 1998?

"A: He inserted his penis inside my anus.

"Q: What did you feel when he inserted his penis inside your anus in the month of July 1998?

"A: It was painful, sir.

"Q:

What else happened besides inserting his penis inside your anus or "Puwet"?

"A: No more, sir.

"Q: And so after that, what did you do?

"A: When my mother arrived last Christmas, I told her what my grandfather did to me.

"Q: You mean that was last Christmas 1998?

"A: Yes, sir.

"Q: And so what actually did you tell your mother xxxxxxxx ?

"A: I told her that my grandfather put his penis inside my vagina.[17]

On cross examination, she recounted:

"Q: You specifically mentioned the word rape when you were asked any unusual incident that happened on June 1998, is that correct?

"A: Yes, sir.

"Q: Who told you or how did you learn the word rape?

"A: Nobody told me, sir.

"Court:

Pero alam mo ba ang meaning nang rape?

Alam mo ba ang ibig sabihin nang rape?

"A: Rape means `Pang gagahasa.'

"x x x x x x x x

"Q:

And because the penis of your Lolo was inserted inside your vagina, you felt pain?

"A: Yes, sir.

"Q: But you did not shout, is that correct?

"A: I was boxing him.

"x x x x x x x x

"Atty. Casas:

You also mentioned that your Lolo raped you by placing his penis inside your mouth, is that correct?

"A: Yes, sir.

"Q: Definitely, you did not like that idea or actuation by your Lolo?

"A: Yes, sir.

"x x x x x x x x

"Q:

By the way, AAA, do you love your Lolo and Lola?

"A: I love my grandmother.

"Q: How about your grandfather, do you love him?

"A: I don't love him.

"Q: Why do you not love your grandfather?

"A: Because, he did something wrong to me."[18]

The trial court has found appellant guilty of having violated Sections 266-A and 266-B of the Revised Penal Code, as amended by Republic Act No. 8353 (Anti-Rape Law of 1997),[19] that read:

"Article 266-A. Rape; When And How Committed. — Rape is committed —

"1) By a man who shall have carnal knowledge of a woman under any of the following circumstances:

a) Through force, threat, or intimidation;

b) When the offended party is deprived of reason or otherwise unconscious;

c) By means of fraudulent machination or grave abuse of authority; and

d) When the offended party is under twelve (12) years of age or is demented, even though none of the circumstances mentioned above be present.

"2) By any person who, under any of the circumstances mentioned in paragraph 1 hereof, shall commit an act of sexual assault by inserting his penis into another person's mouth or anal orifice, or any instrument or object, into

the genital or anal orifice of another person.

"Article 266-B. Penalties. — Rape under paragraph 1 of the next preceding article shall be punished by reclusion perpetua.

"x x x x x x x x

"The death penalty shall also be imposed if the crime of rape is committed with any of the following aggravating/qualifying circumstances:

"1) When the victim is under eighteen (18) years of age and the offender is a parent, ascendant, step-parent, guardian, relative by consanguinity or affinity within the third civil degree, or the common-law spouse of the parent of the victim."

The death penalty for the crime herein charged may be imposed only when the twin qualifying circumstances of relationship between the appellant and the victim and the latter's age are indubitably proven; otherwise, the appellant can only be held liable for the crime of simple rape penalized by reclusion perpetua.[20] The relationship between appellant and the victim has been adequately established. The prosecution evidence has shown that appellant is the grandfather of the victim,[21] a fact that appellant himself has likewise maintained.[22] The same cannot, however, be said with respect to the age of the victim.

In *People vs. Pruna*,[23] the Court, after noting the divergent rulings on proof of age of the victim in rape cases, has set out certain guidelines in appreciating age, either as an element of the crime or as a qualifying circumstance. The primary evidence of age of the victim is her birth certificate. Age may also be proven by such authentic documents as a baptismal certificate and school records only in the absence of a birth certificate. If the aforesaid documents are shown to have been lost or destroyed or otherwise unavailable, the testimony, if clear and credible, of the victim's mother or a member of the family either by affinity or consanguinity who is qualified to testify on matters respecting pedigree such as the exact age or date of birth of the offended party pursuant to Section 40, Rule 130 of the Rules on Evidence shall be sufficient but only under the following circumstances: a) If the victim is alleged to be below 3 years of age and what is sought to be proved is that she is less than 7 years old; b) If the victim is alleged to be below 7 years of age and what is sought to be proved is that she is less than 12 years old; c) If the victim is alleged to be below 12 years of age and what is sought to be proved is that she is less than 18 years old.

In the instant case, the prosecution did not offer the victim's certificate of live birth or any similar authentic document in evidence. The trial court, in convicting the appellant of the crime of rape and imposing upon him the death penalty even in the absence of the necessary documents, relied on the sworn statement of xxxxxxxx, the mother of the victim, attesting to the fact that her daughter AAA was born on 26 May 1990.[24] xxxxxxxx, however, did not testify in court. Such sworn statement was thus inadmissible in evidence under the hearsay rule,[25] and unless the affiant had been placed on the witness stand, the admission of the mere affidavit and the conviction of appellant on the basis thereof would violate the right of the accused to meet witness face to face.[26]

In the absence of a certificate of live birth, authentic document, or the testimony of the victim's mother or relatives concerning the victim's age under the circumstances heretofore mentioned, the complainant's sole testimony can suffice provided that it is expressly and clearly admitted by the accused; to repeat, "provided that it is expressly and clearly admitted by the accused." [27] There is no such declaration and admission on the part of appellant.

This Court cannot be overly strict as regards the proof of age of the victim particularly when, such as under Article 266-B of the Revised Penal Code, as amended by Rep. Act No. 8353, age is an element of the crime that, if shown, would make it punishable by death. As so frequently expressed by the Court, the severity of the death

penalty, which by its nature is irreversible when carried out, should behoove courts to apply the most exacting rules of procedure and evidence. The prosecution is not excused from discharging its burden even when the defense lets itself loose about it.

The trial court ordered appellant to "indemnify the complainant in the amount of P75,000.00 and moral and exemplary damages in the amount of P50,000.00." The award must be corrected. In consonance with prevailing jurisprudence, appellant must be made to pay P50,000.00 civil indemnity, an award that is outrightly due the victim of rape by the mere fact of its commission, P50,000.00 moral damages which is deemed concomitant with and which necessarily results from this odious criminal offense, and P25,000.00 exemplary damages which are awarded under Article 2230 of the Civil Code when the crime is committed with one or more aggravating circumstances[28] such as relationship between the offender and the victim.[29]

WHEREFORE, the judgment of the court a quo finding appellant Diosdado Corial y Requeiz guilty of rape is **AFFIRMED** with **MODIFICATION** in that he is hereby only adjudged guilty of simple, not qualified, rape and sentenced to suffer, instead of the death penalty, the penalty of reclusion perpetua. The award of damages by the trial court is likewise modified by hereby ordering appellant to indemnify the victim the amounts of P50,000.00 civil indemnity, P50,000.00 moral damages and P25,000.00 exemplary damages. Costs de oficio.

SO ORDERED.

Davide, Jr., C.J., Bellosillo, Puno, Panganiban, Quisumbing, Ynares-Santiago, Sandoval-Gutierrez, Carpio, Austria-Martinez, Corona, Carpio-Morales, Callejo, Sr., and Azcuna, JJ., concur.

[1] Presided by Judge Lilia C. Lopez.

[2] Information, Records, p. 9.

[3] Records, p. 16.

[4] Exh. B.

[5] Records, p. 3.

[6] Rollo, p. 33.

[7] People vs. Cantuba, G.R. No. 137454, 18 November 2002.

[8] People vs. Galigao, G.R. Nos. 140961-63, 14 January 2003.

[9] Exh. C, Records, p. 7.

[10] TSN, 8 March 1999, p. 17.

[11] People vs. Quillosa, G.R. No. 115687, 17 February 2000, 325 SCRA 747.

[12] People vs. Cabel, 347 Phil. 82.

[13] People vs. Razonable, G.R. Nos. 128085-87, 12 April 2000, 330 SCRA 562.

[14] People vs. Pruna, G.R. No. 138471, 10 October 2002.

[15] People vs. Silvano, G.R. No. 141105-11, 8 March 2002.

[16] People vs. Amamangpang, 353 Phil. 815, 828 (1998).

[17] TSN, 8 March 1999, pp. 5-7.

[18] TSN, 8 March 1999, pp. 16-21.

[19] 94 O.G. 1507.

[20] People vs. Flores, G.R. No. 130713, 20 January 2000, 322 SCRA 779.

[21] TSN, 8 March 1999, p. 3.

[22] TSN, 10 May 1999, p. 10.

[23] G.R. No. 138471, 10 October 2002.

[24] Rollo, p. 83.

[25] People vs. Alvarez, G.R. No. 70446, 31 January 1989, 169 SCRA 730; People vs. Santos, G.R. No. L-62072, 11 November 1985, 139 SCRA 583; People vs. Ramos, 207 Phil. 269.

[26] Id.

[27] Id.

[27] Id.

[28] People vs. Cabigting, *supra*.

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.