

ERMIN DACLES Y OLEDO, PETITIONER, VS. PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, RESPONDENT.

G.R. No. 171487. March 14, 2008

Ponente: CHICO-NAZARIO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-171487/>

CHICO-NAZARIO, J.:

This petition for review on certiorari under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court assails the Decision[1] dated 19 August 2005 of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CR No. 25188 which affirmed the Decision[2] dated 31 January 2001 of the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Caloocan City, Branch 120, finding petitioner Ermin O. Dacles guilty of the crime of violation of Section 27, Article IV of Republic Act No. 6425, as amended, otherwise known as the Dangerous Drugs Act of 1972.

On 14 December 1998, petitioner, together with co-accused Federico Cleofas y Mateo, Virgilio Cardenas y Gercan, Marcelino Dueñas y Yabut and Maria Fe Mendoza y Pascual, was charged before the RTC with violating Section 27, Article IV of Republic Act No. 6425 in Criminal Case No. C-55283. The accusatory portion of the Information reads:

That on or about the 10[th] day of December, 1998 in Caloocan City, Metro Manila and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, grouping themselves together did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously use and sniff and pass to one another METHAMPHETAMINE HYDROCHLORIDE, without the corresponding prescription therefore and knowing the same to be a regulated drug.[3]

When arraigned, petitioner and co-accused pleaded not guilty. Thereafter, trial ensued.

The prosecution presented three witnesses: PO2 Jessie Caranto, Senior Inspector Juanita D. Siason of the Philippine National Police-Crime Laboratory, and PO3 Romulo Aquino.

Prosecution witness PO2 Jessie Caranto of the District Intelligence Unit (DIU) Northern Police District Office, Larangay Street, Kaunlaran Village, Caloocan City, testified that on 10 December 1998 at around 8:30 in the evening, while he and his two co-police operatives, SPO2 Pascua and PO3 Romulo Aquino, were conducting a surveillance operation along Rubyville Subdivision, Caloocan City, they noticed a Toyota Tamaraw FX utility vehicle bearing Plate No. WDP-587 parked along the side of the street. In order for them not to be noticed, they slowly and cautiously approached the vehicle where they saw five persons engaging in a pot session. The team introduced themselves as police officers and then arrested the suspects. PO2 Caranto gathered the two small transparent plastic sachets containing white crystalline substance believed to be shabu, including drug paraphernalia such as aluminum foil, tubo or pipe and a disposable lighter obtained from the suspects. The suspects and the vehicle were brought to the police headquarters at Larangay Street, Kaunlaran Village, Caloocan City. The confiscated items were turned over to SPO1 Rolando Pascua. PO2 Caranto said it was SPO1 Pascua who gave the confiscated items to the police investigator, SPO2 Marlon Orquia, and that the latter was the one who put the markings on the confiscated materials. The recovered crystalline substance was brought to the

PNP-Crime Laboratory at Camp Crame, Quezon City for examination. During the investigation conducted by the police officers, the suspects gave their names as Ermin Dacles, Virgilio Cardenas, Marcelino Dueñas, Federico Cleofas and Marie Fe Mendoza.

PO3 Romulo Aquino, a member of the team conducting surveillance operation in Sta. Quiteria, Caloocan City, said he and a certain PO1 Soreta stayed outside the Rubyville Subdivision while SPO1 Rolando Pascua, PO2 Jessie Caranto and some members of the Bantay Bayan were the ones who entered the subdivision. He admitted that he did not see the suspects inside the Tamaraw FX engaging in pot session as he was far from the said vehicle.[4]

Upon examination by the forensic analyst, Senior Inspector Juanita D. Siason of the Philippine National Police-Crime Laboratory, the contents of the two plastic heat-sealed transparent sachets were positive for methamphetamine hydrochloride or "shabu."

The prosecution dispensed with the testimony of SPO2 Marlon Orquia and in lieu thereof, it entered into stipulations with the counsel of the accused the following facts: (1) that SPO2 Marlon Orquia was the investigator of the case; and (2) that SPO2 Orquia was the one who prepared the letter requesting a forensic examination of the contents of the two plastic sachets.[5]

The defense, on the other hand, presented Federico Cleofas, Virgilio Cardenas and appellant Ermin Dacles. All of them put up a defense of denial and frame-up.

Accused Federico Cleofas (Federico) testified that at around 7:30 in the evening of 10 December 1998, while he was in the store of his nephew located inside Rubyville Subdivision, Caloocan City, drinking a bottle of softdrink and having a chat with his nephew, a Toyota Tamaraw FX which was driven by accused Marcelo Dueñas, arrived.[6] Accused Virgilio Cardenas and Ermin Dacles were on board the vehicle together with four armed police officers wearing civilian clothes. As the policemen alighted from the vehicle and were going to his direction, Federico, scared of the unfamiliar-looking policemen, ran towards the house of his childhood buddy named Aboy, also a police officer, for help. Before the pursuing police officers could arrest Federico, Aboy took him under his care. After the police officers and Aboy introduced themselves to each other, Aboy allowed the arresting officers to take with them his friend with the assurance that Federico would not be hurt.[7] Federico was then escorted to the Tamaraw FX where he was handcuffed.[8] The arresting officers thereafter asked him of the exact location of his house, but before they arrived at the site Federico indicated, the police officers punched him in the abdomen, suspecting that he was lying about the exact location of his house. Federico also testified that SPO2 Pascua tried to exact from him Twenty Thousand Pesos (P20,000.00) and Ten Thousand Pesos (P10,000.00) from Ermin Dacles and Virgilio Cardenas. When Federico told the police officers that he had no money, PO2 Aquino hit him on the head with a batuta.[9] Thereafter, they were brought to Valenzuela, specifically E. De Leon Street, where the vehicle stopped in front of a store. SPO2 Pascua ordered Federico to call up a relative. Thereupon he contacted Natividad Cleofas, his sister, whom he apprised of his situation. SPO2 Pascua then grabbed the telephone and instructed Natividad Cleofas to proceed to the Langaray Police Station and bring with her P20,000.00 in exchange for Federico's liberty.[10] After the call, they boarded the Tamaraw FX and, while on their way, the police officers picked up accused Ma. Fe Mendoza before finally proceeding to the police station.[11] When Federico was physically examined by a physician, he did not divulge to the doctor that he had a contusion in the head caused by the batuta.

Virgilio Cardenas (Virgilio) also denied the allegations of the prosecution. He testified that on 10 December 1998, at around 7:00 to 8:00 o'clock in the evening, while waiting for a ride home at Sta. Quiteria, Caloocan City, a Tamaraw FX stopped in front of him with its occupants beckoning him inside.[12] Virgilio boarded and saw

Marcelino Dueñas and Ermin Dacles inside the vehicle.[13] When they passed through the police check-point at the Tullahan Road, the policemen manning the checkpoint flagged them down.[14] Police officer Pascua, who was in uniform, frisked the three of them. Police officer Pascua informed them that he was actually looking for a certain person and Marcelino Dueñas volunteered that he knew the person the police officer was looking for.[15] The police officers thus boarded the Tamaraw FX. Upon reaching Rubyville subdivision, he saw the person the policemen were looking for running away from the police officers. The police officers caught him and brought him inside the Tamaraw FX. Thereafter, they proceeded to Valenzuela where the police officers arrested a certain Fe Mendoza. All of the accused were brought to the Langaray Police Headquarters.

Ermin Dacles (Ermin) declared that in the evening of 10 December 1998, he was at Sta. Quiteria Street, Caloocan City, waiting for a tricycle ride.[16] Marcelino Dueñas gave Ermin a ride in the former's Tamaraw FX. When Ermin boarded the vehicle, he noticed that Marcelino Dueñas was with Virgilio Cardenas. Along the way, three police officers, two of whom Ermin recognized as PO3 Romulo A. Aquino and PO2 Jessie Caranto, stopped and searched the vehicle and then eventually boarded it. The group then proceeded to Rubyville Subdivision where the police officers chased and arrested Federico Cleofas.[17] The police officers and the arrested individuals thereafter went to Valenzuela. There the police officers picked up Fe Mendoza. The police then brought all of them to the Larangay Police Headquarters, Caloocan City. While on their way to the police station, SPO1 Pascua demanded from Ermin and the rest of the apprehended men inside the vehicle the amount of P50,000.00. For his part, Ermin replied he had no money.[18]

After weighing the evidence presented by the parties, the RTC was of the belief that the prosecution mustered the requisite quantum of evidence to prove the guilt of the petitioner and other accused of the crime charged. It gave full credence to the version of the prosecution and brushed aside the defenses of denial and frame-up interposed by the appellant and his companions. Thus, it convicted all of them of the offense charged and imposed upon them the indeterminate penalty of 6 months and 1 day as minimum to 6 years as maximum, and to pay the fine of P100.00 each, viz:

WHEREFORE, judgment is hereby rendered finding accused ERMIN DACLES y OLEDO, VIRGILIO CARDENAS y GERCAN, MARCELINO DUEÑAS y YABUT, FEDERICO CLEOFAS y MATEO and MA. FE MENDOZA y PASCUAL GUILTY of the offense charged and sentencing them to suffer a penalty of six (6) months and one (1) day as minimum to six years each as maximum of prision correccional.

The Court orders all the accused to pay P100.00 each as fine to OCC, RTC, Caloocan City.[19]

Only petitioner Ermin Dacles and Federico Cleofas filed a notice of appeal.[20] The RTC ordered the transmittal of the entire records of the case to the Court of Appeals.

The Court of Appeals, on 19 August 2005, promulgated its Decision affirming the judgment of the RTC convicting appellant and the other accused therein.[21] It, however, modified the penalty by reducing the same to 6 months of arresto mayor, as minimum, to 4 years and 2 months of prision correccional as maximum. It deleted the fine of P100.00. The dispositive part of the decision reads:

WHEREFORE, the Decision appealed from is AFFIRMED with MODIFICATION by REDUCING the penalty to six (6) months of arresto mayor, as minimum, to four (4) years and two (2) months of prision correccional, as maximum, and DELETING the fine of P100.00.[22]

On 9 September 2005, Ermin Dacles and Federico Cleofas filed a motion for reconsideration which was denied by the Court of Appeals in a Resolution dated 7 February 2006.

Hence, the instant petition filed by Ermin Dacles.

In his Memorandum, the petitioner raises a single issue:

WHETHER THE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF THE REGIONAL TRIAL COURT FINDING THE PETITIONER GUILTY BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT FOR VIOLATION OF SECTION 27, ARTICLE IV OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 6425.[23]

Petitioner faults the RTC and the Court of Appeals in giving full credence to the testimony of PO2 Caranto who testified that he saw petitioner and his companions engaged in a pot session. Petitioner stresses that PO2 Caranto's testimony should not have been believed since said testimony was not even corroborated by prosecution witness PO2 Romulo Aquino. Petitioner argues that the RTC and the Court of Appeals cannot use the presumption of regularity in the performance of official functions in convicting petitioner since the said principle cannot prevail over the constitutional presumption of innocence of the accused. He insists that although the defense of alibi and denial are weak, it is still the duty of the prosecution to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt to support a judgment of conviction.

He also maintains that he deserves an acquittal since there exists a doubt as to whether the items confiscated from them, assuming *arguendo* that the prosecution's theory were true, were the same specimens submitted for laboratory examination and which tested positive for methamphetamine hydrochloride. According to petitioner, there is a possibility that switching of evidence could occur and that the specimens seized from them were not the same items subjected to laboratory examination.

The Office of the Solicitor General avers that the questions involving the alleged testimonial veracity or credibility are inappropriate in the instant petition as only questions of law may be raised in a petition for review. It also assails appellant's belated attempt of raising as an issue for the first time the identity of the confiscated items. It states that the identity of the shabu should have been questioned at the trial stage to afford the prosecution reasonable opportunity to meet such objection. Since this issue was not raised before the RTC nor before the Court of Appeals, appellant cannot raise the same before this Court.

We deal first with the argument raised by the Office of the Solicitor General that it is too late for petitioner to raise the issue on the identity of the confiscated shabu. The long-standing precept is that an appeal in a criminal case throws the whole case wide open for review. [24] The reviewing tribunal can correct errors though unassigned in the appeal, or even reverse the trial court's decision on grounds other than those the parties raised as errors.[25]

In *People v. Dorimon*, [26] appellant was convicted by the trial court of the crime of Illegal Possession of Firearm. On appeal before the Court, appellant failed to raise the issue of failure of the prosecution to prove his non-possession of a license to possess a firearm. Notwithstanding this, the Court took cognizance of the issue. Likewise, in *People v. Galigao*, [27] appellant was found by the trial court guilty of rape on three counts. On automatic review, appellant raised for the first time before the Court the defense of insanity. The Court addressed the issue consistent with the dictum that an appeal in a criminal case throws the whole case open for review and the reviewing court may correct errors even if they have not been assigned. With these cases as guideposts, petitioner is legally allowed to raise an issue which was not raised before the RTC or the Court of Appeals. Despite this ruling, however, the Court finds no compelling reason to acquit petitioner in the instant case.

The bone of contention in this case is the credibility of the parties and their witnesses. This Court will not disturb the judgment of the trial court in assessing the credibility of the witnesses, unless there appears in the records some facts or circumstances of weight and influence which have been overlooked or the significance of which has been misinterpreted by the trial court. This is because the trial judge has the unique opportunity, denied to the appellate court, to observe the witnesses and to note their demeanor, conduct and attitude under direct and

cross-examination. In this case, the evidence in the records fully supports the trial court's finding that petitioner violated Section 27, Article IV of Republic Act No. 6425. Petitioner and his companions were sniffing shabu inside the Tamaraw FX parked in a street inside Rubyville Subdivision. PO2 Jessie Caranto was able to observe from a distance of two meters what petitioner and his cohorts were doing inside the vehicle, as the vehicle had transparent glass windows and considering that the vehicle was parked within five meters of a lit Meralco post. When PO2 Caranto and his companions took custody of the suspects, they obtained from the latter two sachets of shabu and the paraphernalia used in the pot session. PO2 Caranto unwaveringly narrated the incident as follows:

A:

When we conducted a surveillance at Rubyville Subdivision, Caloocan City sir we found one (1) Tamaraw FX Van bearing Plate No. WDP-587 parked along the street, sir.

Q:

Where is this located?

A:

At Rubyville Subdivision, Caloocan City, sir.

Q:

Now, you mentioned about one Tamaraw FX Van WDP-587, what is this Tamaraw FX doing?

A:

There were unidentified male persons on board that Tamaraw FX engaged in pot session sir.

Q:

The first time you saw this van or this Tamaraw FX vehicle, where were you Mr. Witness?

A:

I am near the Tamaraw FX maybe two (2) meters away, sir.

x x x x

Q:

This Tamaraw FX has glasses on the sidings?

A:

Transparent, sir.

Q:

So you can easily identify the persons inside the Tamaraw FX?

A:

Yes, sir.

x x x x

Q:

What did you do when you saw the parked Tamaraw FX?

A:

We introduced ourselves as law men and assigned at the DIU and arrested them.

x x x x

Q:

With this two (2) meters distance, what were these persons doing at that time?

A:

x x x they were using drugs known as shabu.

x x x x

Q:

After seeing the persons sniffing the prohibited drugs you mentioned, what did your team do next?

A:

We arrested them x x x.

x x x x

Q:

And what did they do?

A:

They opened the door of the vehicle sir.

Q:

And after they opened the vehicle what did you see inside?

A:

We saw the paraphernalias and we confiscated all the evidence.

x x x x

Q:

And, where did you gather the evidence?

A:

Paraphernalias, sir.

Q:

Will you describe these paraphernalias Mr. Witness?

A:

Two (2) small transparent plastic sachets containing white crystalline substance suspected to be shabu, aluminum foil, tubo or pipe, lighter.

x x x x

Q:

So there are only two (2) plastic sachets allegedly containing shabu?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

And you were the one who retrieved the paraphernalias from the five (5) persons?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

And police officers Pascua and Chua what were they doing then?

A:

They brought the other accused to our office for further investigation.

Q:

How about the vehicle the Tamaraw FX?

A:

It is already impounded, sir.

Q:

Were you able to know the persons brought to your station Mr. Witness?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

Will you tell us the names of these persons if you can remember?

A:

I cannot remember their names, sir.

Q:

Can you recall their faces Mr. Witness?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

Can you identify them if you see them? Are they inside the courtroom this morning?

A:

Yes, sir.[28]

On cross-examination, PO2 Caranto described the relative positions of the suspects inside the vehicle when they were arrested:

Q:

Mr. Witness can you tell us who were [seated] at the back, in the middle and front portion of the vehicle?

A:

The four of them and the other one is the driver. Ermin Dacles is [seated] at the middle portion of the vehicle.

Q:

What about Cardenas, where was he [seated]?

A:

In the middle portion sir.

Q:

What about Maria Fe Mendoza where was she [seated]?

A:

At the back portion sir.

Q:

So what about Cleofas?

A:

I saw him with Maria Fe Mendoza sir.

Q:

So, what about Dueñas?

A:

He is the driver sir.

Court:

Where did you come from, behind the parked Tamaraw FX or in front of the parked Tamaraw FX?

A:

From the front portion of the vehicle sir.

Q:

And despite the fact you came from the front side you were [not] noticed by Dueñas in the driver's seat?

A:

No, sir he was "nakayuko."

Q:

While you chanced upon the parked Tamaraw FX vehicle and doing some surveillance who among the accused in this case that you noticed which lead you to approach the vehicle?

A:

The four (4) of them.

Q:

Mr. Witness, who among the accused did you notice that made you approached the vehicle?

A:

The four (4) of them were [seated] at the back.

Q:

Was the FX parked in a dark place?

A:

It was lighted sir.

Q:

How far from the Meralco post if there was a Meralco post?

A:

About five (5) meters away.

Q:

And will you describe what was their respective positions?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

What were they doing?

A:

"Gumagamit sila." "May hinihithit na tubo," sir.

Q:

You were not noticed when you approached them?

A:

No, sir because they were surprised.[29]

PO3 Romulo Aquino corroborated the testimony of PO2 Caranto that indeed there was a police surveillance conducted inside Rubyville Subdivision. Although PO3 Aquino admitted that he was stationed outside the

subdivision and therefore was not with PO2 Caranto when the latter arrested the suspects, he confirmed that petitioner and his companions were arrested inside the Rubyville Subdivision. In fact, PO3 Aquino accompanied the arrested suspects to the police station.

The version depicted by the prosecution, through the testimonies of PO2 Caranto and PO3 Aquino, could only be described by people who actually witnessed the event that took place on the night of 10 December 1998. Only trustworthy witnesses could have narrated with such detail and realism what really happened on the date referred to.

As has been repeatedly held, credence shall be given to the narration of the incident by the prosecution witnesses especially when they are police officers who are presumed to have performed their duties in a regular manner, unless there be evidence to the contrary. Moreover, in the absence of proof of motive to falsely impute such a serious crime to petitioner, the presumption of regularity in the performance of official duty, as well as the findings of the trial court on the credibility of witnesses, shall prevail over appellant's self-serving and uncorroborated claim of having been framed.

This Court, of course, is not unaware that in some instances law enforcers resort to the practice of planting evidence to extract information or even to harass civilians. But the defense of frame-up in drug cases requires strong and convincing evidence because of the presumption that the law enforcement agencies acted in the regular performance of their official duties. Moreover, the defense of denial or frame-up, like alibi, has been viewed by the court with disfavor for it can just as easily be concocted and is a common and standard defense ploy in most prosecutions for violation of the Dangerous Drugs Act.

In the case under consideration, there is no evidence of any improper motive on the part of the police officers who apprehended petitioner and his companions. The defense witnesses even admitted that they did not know the apprehending police officers and that they had no quarrel with said law enforcers.[30] With this admission by the defense, it is readily clear that the claim of frame-up is baseless.

A scrutiny of the version of the petitioner reveals incredulous specifics and details which are far from ordinary human experience. Also, the testimonies of the defense witnesses failed to dovetail with each other on significant points. Petitioner testified that he did not know Federico Cleofas, nor had he seen the latter prior to their arrest on 10 December 1998.[31] Federico Cleofas, on the other hand, declared that he had known petitioner for about a year prior to 10 December 1998, as they used to play basketball in Valenzuela.[32] Another disturbing inconsistency of the defense was the statement given by petitioner that when he boarded the Tamaraw FX, Virgilio Cardenas was already inside and was seated at the middle passenger portion of the vehicle.[33] But Virgilio Cardenas contradicted this when he testified that petitioner was there before he boarded the vehicle.[34]

At one point, petitioner averred that after he and his companions were wrongfully arrested in Caloocan City, the arresting police officers proceeded to Valenzuela where the latter arrested Maria Fe Mendoza. This is incredible because the only persons who could have known the whereabouts of Maria Fe Mendoza were the petitioner and his co-accused, since they were the ones who knew Maria Fe. The police officers, as the defense witnesses admitted, were strangers to them. Clearly, the police officers could not have known where Maria Fe was. The story of the defense is simply implausible.

Petitioner insists that the shabu confiscated from them was not established by the prosecution. Records disprove this. PO2 Caranto positively identified in court the two plastic sachets containing shabu which were confiscated from petitioner and his cohorts. Although he did not place his initials on the sachets of shabu after the confiscation, he was able to identify the same, since he testified that it was the police investigator who placed

identifying marks thereon; thus:

Q:

If I show you again the two plastic sachets of shabu which you retrieved from all the accused in this case, will you be able to identify it?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

I am showing to you two (2) plastic sachets of shabu, will you please go over the same and tell us what is the relation of two plastic sachets to the one you confiscated?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

What is the relation of this Mr. Witness?

A:

This is the same sir.

Court:

Why are you certain that these are the same you picked up inside the Tamaraw FX?

A:

I know it, the other plastic is longer than the other one.

x x x x

Q:

Now Mr. Witness just a while ago you were being asked by the Honorable Court whether you can identify the two (2) sachets as a matter of fact it was presented to you and you already identified the same?

A:

Yes, sir.

Q:

Do you confirm to this Honorable Court that you [did] not put any marking?

A:

It is our investigator who placed marking there sir.[35]

Undoubtedly, the identity of the corpus delicti has been duly established by the prosecution in this case.[36]

We are convinced that in the evening of 10 December 1998, an honest-to-goodness apprehension of the petitioner and his friends for sniffing shabu was made by the police officers composed of PO2 Caranto and his colleagues. The positive identification made by the police officers and the laboratory report, not to mention the incredible

defense of frame-up to which petitioner resorted, sufficiently proved beyond reasonable doubt that he committed the crime charged.

The Court of Appeals imposed on petitioner the indeterminate penalty of 6 months of arresto mayor, as minimum, to 4 years and 2 months of prision correccional as maximum. In *Teodosio v. Court of Appeals*,^[37] which cited *People v. Simon*,^[38] the Court spelled out the proper penalties for drug-related crimes under Republic Act No. 6425, as amended by Republic Act No. 7659. The appropriate penalty is reclusion perpetua if the quantity of the drug weighs 750 grams or more. If the drug weighs less than 250 grams, the penalty to be imposed is prision correccional; from 250 grams to 499 grams, prision mayor; and, from 500 grams to 749 grams, reclusion temporal.

In the instant case, the Reports of Forensic Analyst Juanita D. Sioson show that the two plastic sachets contained the total weight of 0.19 gram. Since the quantity of the shabu weighs less than 250 grams, the proper penalty should be no more than prision correccional. There being neither generic mitigating nor aggravating circumstances, the penalty of prision correccional shall be imposed in its medium period. And applying the Indeterminate Sentence Law, the minimum period shall be within the range of the penalty next lower in degree which is arresto mayor. Thus, the imposition of the penalty of 6 months of arresto mayor, as minimum to 4 years and 2 months of prision correccional as maximum is proper. No fine is imposable in this case because petitioner's penalty is not reclusion perpetua or death.^[39]

WHEREFORE, the Decision of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CR No. 25188 which affirmed the Decision of the Regional Trial Court Caloocan City, Branch 120, convicting petitioner Ermin Dacles y Oledo for violation of Section 27, Article IV of Republic Act No. 6425, as amended by Republic Act No. 7659, and sentencing him to suffer an indeterminate penalty from 6 months of arresto mayor, as minimum to 4 years and 2 months of prision correccional as maximum, is **AFFIRMED** in toto.

SO ORDERED.

Ynares-Santiago, (Chairperson), Austria-Martinez, Corona, and Reyes, JJ., concur.

[1] Penned by Associate Justice Marina L. Buzon with Associate Justices Mario L. Guariña III and Santiago Javier Ranada, concurring; rollo, pp. 68-77.

[2] Penned by Judge Victorino S. Alvaro; rollo, pp. 41-46.

[3] Records, p. 1.

[4] TSN, 31 May 1999, p. 6.

[5] Records, p. 203.

[6] TSN, 11 August 1999, p. 4.

[7] Id. at 6-8.

[8] Id. at 9.

[9] Id. at 10-11.

[10] Id. at 12.

- [11] Id. at 14.
- [12] TSN, 15 September 1999, p. 3.
- [13] Id.
- [14] Id. at 4.
- [15] Id. at 5.
- [16] TSN, 30 May 2000, p. 4.
- [17] Id. at 7.
- [18] Id. at 11.
- [19] Rollo, p. 46.
- [20] Records, p. 360.
- [21] Rollo, pp. 68-77.
- [22] Id. at 76.
- [23] Id. at 123-124.
- [24] *People v. Jubail*, G.R. No. 143718, 19 May 2004, 428 SCRA 478, 491.
- [25] *People v. Miranda*, G.R. No. 174773, 2 October 2007, 534 SCRA 552, 563-564.
- [26] 378 Phil. 660 (1999).
- [27] 443 Phil. 246 (2003).
- [28] TSN, 4 May 1999, pp. 3-9.
- [29] TSN, 4 May 1999, pp. 16-18.
- [30] TSN, 30 May 2000, p. 11.
- [31] Id. at 7-8.
- [32] TSN, 11 August 1999, p. 20.
- [33] TSN, 30 May 2000, pp. 4, 11.
- [34] TSN, 16 September 1999, pp. 3, 4.
- [35] TSN, 4 May 1999, pp. 11-12, 14.
- [36] *People v. Miranda*, supra note 25 at 568; *People v. Manalo*, G.R. No. 107623, 23 February 1994, 230 SCRA 309, 318.
- [37] G.R. No. 124346, 8 June 2004, 431 SCRA 194, 209.
- [38] G.R. No. 93028, 29 July 1994, 234 SCRA 555.
- [39] *Teodosio v. Court of Appeals*, supra note 37.

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.