

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, APPELLEE, VS. BELBAN SIC-OPEN Y DIMAS, APPELLANT.*G.R. No. 211680. September 21, 2016*

Ponente: PERALTA, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-211680/>**PERALTA, J.:**

On appeal is the July 23, 2013 Decision[1] and October 9, 2013 Resolution[2] of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CR-HC No. 05546, which affirmed the February 28, 2012 Decision[3] and April 24, 2012 Order[4] of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 8, La Trinidad, Benguet, in Criminal Case No. 09-CR-7596, convicting appellant Belban Sic-open y Dimas (Belban) of illegal sale of marijuana in violation of Section 5, Article II of Republic Act (R.A.) No. 9165 or the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002.

In an Information dated February 26, 2009, Belban was charged as follows:

That on or about the 4[th] day of February, 2009, at Poblacion, Municipality of Kibungan, Province of Benguet, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, without any authority of law, did then and there knowingly, willfully and unlawfully sell and deliver to Intelligence Officer 1 Berto C. Chumanao, a member of the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency who acted as poseur-buyer, Thirty (30) bricks of dried Marijuana, a dangerous drug, with a total weight of Twenty-Six Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty-Eight & 3/10 (26,768.3) grams, in violation of said law.

CONTRARY TO LAW.[5]

In his arraignment, Belban entered a plea of "Not Guilty." [6] Trial ensued while he was under detention. The prosecution presented Intelligence Officer (IO) 1 Berto Chumanao (Chumanao), IO Maydette Mosing (Mosing), and IO Honoria Asiong (Asiong), Senior Police Officer (SPO) 4 Romeo Abordo (Abordo), Police Senior Inspector (PSI) Rowena Fajardo Canlas (Canlas), and PO1 Dennis Delos Reyes (Delos Reyes). Only Belban testified for the defense.

Evidence for the Prosecution

In the second week of December 2008, a male informant walked at the office of the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency-Cordillera Administrative Region (PDEA-CAR) in Camp Bado Dangwa, La Trinidad, Benguet. As the one on duty at the time, Chumanao attended to the informant, who reported that a certain Belban was selling marijuana and looking for a buyer. The informant revealed that he was actually a middleman personally known to and engaged by Belban to find buyers, but he wanted to change his life. After the disclosure, Chumanao turned him over to Police Chief Inspector and Officer-in-Charge Edgar S. Apalla (Apalla), who authorized him to "build-up" the case and form a buy-bust team if needed. Upon Chumanao's request, the informant gave him the cellphone number of Belban. The informant was likewise told to call Belban and introduce him as a buyer. Chumanao started communicating with Belban two to three days after. As the informant told him that Belban was from Kibungan, Benguet, he talked to him in Kankanaey dialect since he stayed in Sagpat, Kibungan for some years after getting married there. He texted Belban that he was the person who would buy the marijuana as told to

him (Belban) by the informant. On December 15, 2008, Chumanao received a text message from Belban inquiring if he was still interested in buying marijuana. After replying in the affirmative, Belban said that the marijuana, which he referred to as "nateng" (vegetable), would be available in February 2009. When asked how many bricks he could sell, Belban responded that he could deliver thirty (30) bricks.

On February 3, 2009, Chumanao received a text message from Belban that the marijuana were already available at dawn of the following day. It was agreed that he would pick them up in Poblacion, Kibungan near the school between 3:00 a.m. and 4:00 a.m. With the information, Chumanao called IOs Macad, Mosing, and Asiong, who arrived at 3:00 p.m. They were briefed that they would proceed to Kibungan to meet Belban, who would be selling them marijuana. Their respective tasks as members of the buy-bust team were assigned - Chumanao as poseur-buyer, Asiong as arresting officer, Mosing as seizing officer, and Macad as the one who would read the constitutional rights of the accused. Also, the team prepared the boodle money consisting of two (2) Five Hundred Peso (P500.00) bills and fifty-eight (58) mimeo papers cut into money size. Chumanao placed his initials ("BCC") on the genuine P500.00 bills. By 12 midnight, they "jumped off to the meeting place from the PDEA field office in Melvin Jones, Baguio City using a service vehicle (Toyota Revo) with a driver. At 3:00 a.m. of February 4, they arrived in the area and parked at the Dangwa terminal located at the turning point of the Dangwa bus in Poblacion, Kibungan. After waiting for a few minutes, Belban approached them. Chumanao knew him because he texted him upon arrival and their service vehicle was the only one parked in the vicinity. Not wanting to stay long in the area, he immediately asked him where the marijuana was. Belban directed Chumanao to follow him. He alighted from the vehicle and went with him towards the road proceeding to the back of the school, which was about 30-45 meters away. The other members of the buy-bust team slowly followed using the service vehicle.

At the road side, two brown cartons tied with straw were placed near the school canteen. When Belban told Chumanao that they contained the marijuana, the latter checked one of the cartons. He untied a carton and saw square-shaped items individually wrapped in newspaper. After opening an item, he confirmed that it was marijuana in brick form. When Belban demanded the payment, Chumanao handed to him the boodle money. As Belban put it in the left pocket of his polo shirt, Chumanao grabbed his arm and told him, "Arestado ka!," which was the pre-arranged signal. The rest of the buy-bust team, who witnessed the unfolding of events while they were inside the trailing vehicle, then rushed to the scene and assisted in the arrest. Asiong handcuffed Belban, Mosing conducted a body search, and Macad read his constitutional rights. Mosing recovered a Nokia 6110 cellular phone, which she marked with her initial, signature, and date. The two cartons containing the marijuana bricks were taken and loaded inside the back of the vehicle. Chumanao opened the cartons and counted fifteen (15) bricks in each carton. The 15 bricks were individually wrapped in newspapers and were collectively wrapped in a green plastic bag that was placed in each carton. Considering that it was still too dark and the team was anxious for its safety, a preliminary inventory of the seized items was made in the presence of Belban and the buy-bust team members. Using a Pentel pen, Chumanao wrote his initials, signature, and date on each of the 30 bricks, the two (2) green plastic bag, and the two cartons.

Thereafter, the buy-bust team, together with Belban, made a short stop at the Kibungan Police Station for the police blotter as well as to show the seized items and the person arrested.[7] They immediately proceeded to Camp Dangwa, where they arrived at past 7:00 a.m. There, the team prepared the affidavits of the members of the buy-bust team, the booking sheet and arrest report, and the requests for physical examination on Belban and laboratory test on the drug items. Chumanao, Asiong, Macad, and Mosing then turned-over the drug (marijuana bricks with the containers) and non-drug items (cellular phone and boodle money) to SPO4 Abordo, who, as the Evidence Custodian of PDEA-CAR, conducted the inventory of the seized items.

The confiscated items were inventoried in the presence of the police officers, Belban, and the representatives of

the Department of Justice (Special Prosecutor Winston T. Suaking), the media (Manny Fortuny), and the barangay (Kagawad Ponciano N. Tero), who then signed the inventory. Photographs of the inventory held were also taken. Thereafter, Abordo kept the non-drug items at the evidence room of Camp Dangwa, while he delivered the marijuana bricks to the PNP Crime Laboratory. PSI Canlas, the Forensic Chemist of PNP-CAR, was the one who actually received the request and the illegal drug. She was the one who conducted the physical, chemical, and confirmatory examinations, and concluded that all the specimens submitted were positive for the presence of marijuana. After issuing the final report, she turned-over the marijuana bricks to PO1 Delos Reyes, the Evidence Custodian of then PNP Crime Laboratory at Camp Dangwa, who locked them up in the evidence room for safekeeping until he brought them to the trial upon court order.

Evidence for the Defense

Belban, who was a resident of Legab, Kayapa, Bakun, Benguet, had been engaged in planting rice for fifteen (15) years. On February 4, 2009, he was in Kibungan because his brother, Sixto Sic-open, who was married in that place sent him a text message a day before. He was asked if he would like to come and see the Sayote Plantation in Epi, Kibungan that he (Sixto) was leasing and to decide if he would like to rent it also. He started to hike from Kayapa, Bakun at 9:00 p.m. and arrived at Poblacion, Kibungan around 2:00 a.m. He proceeded directly to the school canteen to wait for the 3:00 a.m. bus trip to Baguio City. While there, he noticed that there were other waiting passengers. The school canteen was in fact open and there were people inside drinking coffee. To secure a seat, he decided to go to the bus terminal, which was about forty (40) meters away. While on his way, a male passenger of a white vehicle asked him the location of the school canteen. When the man requested for a company, he agreed to go with him thinking that he was probably a new visitor. Upon reaching the back of the school canteen, which was the one facing the road, there were two cartons left. The man directly went to it and opened it. Less than a minute later, while he was walking back towards the terminal, the man suddenly handcuffed him without any explanation. Knowing that there were people inside the canteen, he attempted to shout but the man pointed a gun to his mouth. He was then directed to board the vehicle. When he questioned them, they replied that maybe the cartons were his baggages. Despite saying that he did not know anything and that he did not own them, they insisted and did not believe him. He asked what were the contents of the cartons and they answered that they contained marijuana. He reiterated that he did not know anything about them. They then went to Kibungan Police Station where he was made to sit down and stay for thirty (30) minutes while the alleged marijuana bricks were left inside the vehicle. They then proceeded to Camp Dangwa, where they arrived at around 8:00 a.m. There, he was made to sit in a small room for about seven (7) hours. By 4:00 p.m., they let him out and brought him to their office where he noticed marijuana bricks on the table. They asked him to go near them for a photo shoot. He saw some persons around, but did not know their names. He did not recall if somebody asked him to sign any document or paper. The Inventory of Seized Items was never shown to him. He did not recall that Arty. Suaking, Fortuny or Kag. Tero were introduced to him.

RTC Ruling

On February 28, 2012, the RTC found Belban guilty of the crime charged and sentenced him to suffer the penalty of life imprisonment and to pay a fine in the amount of Five Hundred Thousand Pesos (P500,000.00). In ruling that the prosecution evidence proved with moral certainty that the sale of marijuana bricks was consummated, the trial court opined:

x x x [T]he commission of the offense of illegal sale of dangerous drugs merely requires the consummation of the selling transaction, which happens the moment the buyer receives the drug from the seller. As long as the police officer went through the operation as a buyer, whose offer was accepted by appellant, followed by the delivery of the dangerous drugs to the former, the crime is already consummated.

Were these elements established? The court answers in the positive. PDEA Agent Chumanao testified that he was the designated poseur-buyer who made the arrangements with the seller for the purchase of thirty bricks of dried marijuana. The date and place of the sale was agreed upon with the further agreement that it would be the buyer who would go to the agreed place to pick up the marijuana bricks. Thus[,] on February 4, 2009, the team of Agent Chumanao found its way to Kibungan, Benguet to meet with the seller and pick up the marijuana bricks. True enough, the seller met them at the designated place and led them to the object of the sale. Satisfied that the object was indeed marijuana bricks, poseur-buyer Agent Chumanao parted with the purchase price. Once the purchase price was in the hands of the seller, the poseur-buyer effected the arrest. x x x.[8]

It was also held that the chain of custody of the seized marijuana bricks had been unbroken:

In the case at bar, the prosecution evidence shows that right after the arrest of the accused the two boxes containing the marijuana bricks were loaded into the vehicle. Right there and then Agent Chumanao marked the bricks with his initials "BCC" and indicated the date and time of seizure on all the bricks in the presence of the accused. Considering that it was still dark and the place was quite isolated, the team left the place and went back to their office. The marijuana bricks were turned over to the PDEA Evidence Custodian SPO4 Romeo Abordo.

Upon receipt of the marijuana bricks that morning of February 4, 2009, SPO4 Abordo conducted the inventory. The marijuana bricks were laid out on the: table and all the bricks bore the initials of the poseur-buyer. Witnessing the inventory were the accused, Prosecutor Winston Suaking, Barangay Kagawad Ponciano N. Tero and media member Manny Fortuny. The prosecution evidence also consists of pictures taken during the inventory.

There is no doubt then that the inventory required by law has been conducted in the presence of all those required by law to be present. Further, the inventory has been documented.

The seized items were then brought to the Crime Laboratory and Forensic Chemist PSI Rowena Canlas testified that what she received were thirty bricks of marijuana all with the markings "BCC", the date "02/04/09" and a signature. She compared the items she received with the description on the letter-request for examination and they were exactly the same.

After her examination, she turned over the marijuana bricks to the Crime Laboratory Evidence Custodian. The evidence custodian, PO1 Dennis delos Reyes brought the marijuana bricks to court and the court saw for itself the markings made by the poseur-buyer and the forensic chemist. Also, in his testimony, the poseur-buyer Agent Churnanao identified the marijuana bricks brought by PO1 Delos Reyes as the same items he seized from the accused. In the same vein, Forensic Chemist Canlas identified the same items as the one turned over to her by the PDEA Evidence Custodian and which she subjected to laboratory examination.

Clearly then the marijuana bricks seized from the accused were the same marijuana bricks brought to court. The chain of custody of the illegal drugs has not been compromised.[9]

CA Ruling

On appeal, the CA sustained Belban's conviction. After adopting the narration of facts of the RTC, it concluded that all the elements of the crime were established beyond reasonable doubt. The appellate court noted that the testimony of Chumanao was corroborated by Mosing and Asiong in material points. Add to this the fact that all of them executed an affidavit relative to the buy-bust operation and identified Belban in open court. Further, the presumption of regularity in the performance of official duties was not successfully disputed because no improper motive on the part of police authorities was proven. Finally, as to compliance with Section 21, Article II of R.A. No. 9165, the CA held that, based on the testimonial and documentary evidence of the prosecution and contrary to the unsubstantiated claim of Belban, there was no gap in the chain of custody of the seized marijuana. For the

appellate court, minor discrepancies in the testimonies and inconsistencies on peripheral matters neither vitiate the essential integrity of the evidence in its entirety nor reflect adversely on the credibility of the prosecution witnesses.

In his Supplemental Brief,[10] Belban manifested that, as he had consistently pleaded in the Appellant's Brief, Reply Brief and Motion for Reconsideration filed before the CA, the chain of custody rule was not followed by the buy-bust team; hence, the trial; court decision must be reversed and a new one be rendered acquitting him of the crime charged.

The Court's Ruling

We dismiss the appeal.

For a successful prosecution of illegal sale of dangerous drugs under Section 5,[11] Article II of R.A. 9165, the following elements must be satisfied: (1) the identity of the buyer and the seller, the object of the sale, and the consideration; and (2) the delivery of the thing sold and the payment therefor.[12] The delivery of the illicit drug to the poseur-buyer and the receipt by the seller of the marked money consummate the illegal transaction.[13]

In this case, all the requisites of the illegal sale of marijuana were met. The identities of the buyer, the seller, the prohibited drug, and the marked money have all been proven beyond reasonable doubt by the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses and the supporting documents they presented and offered in evidence. In open court, Chumanao identified the person of Belban; the 30 bricks of marijuana he marked; the markings he placed on the two cartons, green-plastic bags, and the sack used to cover the cartons; and the boodle money he prepared.[14] Likewise, in her testimony, Mosing identified Belban; the two cartons, the green plastics, and the 30 bricks of marijuana which were marked by Chumanao in her presence; the booking sheet; and the requests for physical examination of the accused and laboratory examination of the suspected illegal drugs.[15] On her part, Asiong affirmed the Joint affidavit she executed with Mosing and Macad as well as identified Belban, the inventory sheet, and the photographs taken.[16]

It is inconsequential that the text messages between Chumanao and Belban pertaining to all communications prior to the alleged consummation of the illegal sale of marijuana were not presented as evidence. What matters is the proof; that the transaction or sale transpired, coupled with the presentation in court of the prohibited drug, the corpus delicti, as evidence.[17] As the RTC and the CA found, taken together, the testimonies of Chumanao, Mosing, and Asiong as to what transpired before, during, and after the buy-bust operation are consistent on material and relevant points.

Against the overwhelming evidence for the prosecution, Belban merely denied the accusations against him. We have invariably viewed with disfavor the defense of denial and frame-up because it can easily be concocted and it is a common and standard defense ploy in prosecutions for violation of R.A. No. 9165.[18] In order to prosper, the defense of denial and frame-up must be proved with strong and convincing evidence.[19] The burden of proof is on Belban to defeat the presumption that the police officers properly performed their official duties. He failed. No bad faith was actually shown. He did not substantiate any illicit motive on the part of the police officers, as to why, of all the allegedly numerous passengers who were also waiting for the bus near the school canteen, they would choose to falsely implicate him in a very serious crime that would cause his imprisonment for life. For this failure, the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses deserve full faith and credit.

Furthermore, the Court holds that the chain of custody of the seized marijuana did not suffer from significant flaws.

Pertinent portion of Section 21, Article II of R.A. No. 9165 mandates:

SEC. 21. Custody and Disposition of Confiscated, Seized, and/or Surrendered Dangerous Drugs, Plant Sources of Dangerous Drugs, Controlled Precursors and Essential Chemicals, Instruments/ Paraphernalia and/or Laboratory Equipment. — The PDEA shall take charge and have custody of all dangerous drugs, plant sources of dangerous drugs, controlled precursors and essential chemicals, as well as instruments/paraphernalia and/or laboratory equipment so confiscated, seized and/or surrendered, for proper disposition in the following manner:

(1) The apprehending team having initial custody and control of the drugs shall, immediately after seizure and confiscation, physically inventory and photograph the same in the presence of the accused or the person/s from whom such items were confiscated and/or seized, or his/her representative or counsel, a representative from the media and the Department of Justice (DOJ), and any elected public official who shall be required to sign the copies of the inventory and be given a copy thereof;

(2) Within twenty-four (24) hours upon confiscation/seizure of dangerous drugs, plant sources of dangerous drugs, controlled precursors and essential chemicals, as well as instruments/paraphernalia and/or laboratory equipment, the same shall be submitted to the PDEA Forensic Laboratory for a qualitative and quantitative examination;

(3) A certification of the forensic laboratory examination results, which shall be done under oath by the forensic laboratory examiner, shall be issued within twenty-four (24) hours after the receipt of the subject item/s: Provided, That when the volume of the dangerous drugs, plant sources of dangerous drugs, and controlled precursors and essential chemicals does not allow the completion of testing within the time frame, a partial laboratory examination report shall be provisionally issued stating therein the quantities of dangerous drugs still to be examined by the forensic laboratory: Provided, however, That a final certification shall be issued on the completed forensic laboratory examination on the same within the next twenty-four (24) hours;

x x x

Section 21 (a) of the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) further provides:

(a) The apprehending officer/team having initial custody and control of the drugs shall, immediately after seizure and confiscation, physically inventory and photograph the same in the presence of the accused or the person/s from whom such items were confiscated and/or seized, or his/her representative or counsel, a representative from the media and the Department of Justice (DOJ), and any elected public official who shall be required to sign the copies of the inventory and be given a copy thereof; Provided, that the physical inventory and photograph shall be conducted at the place where the search warrant is served; or at the nearest police station or at the nearest office of the apprehending officer/team, whichever is practicable, in case of warrantless seizures; Provided, further, that non-compliance with these requirements under justifiable grounds, as long as the integrity and the evidentiary value of the seized items are properly preserved by the apprehending officer/team, shall not render void and invalid such seizures of and custody over said items[.]

Belban insists that the marijuana bricks should have been physically inventoried and photographed by the apprehending team at Kibungan, Benguet in the presence of the representatives of the media, the DOJ, and the barangay.

We are not persuaded.

As long as the integrity and evidentiary value of an illegal drug were not compromised, non-compliance with R.A. No. 9165 and its IRR may be excused. The Court, in *People v. Asislo*,^[20] *People v. Lara III*,^[21] *Miclat, Jr. v. People*,^[22] and *People v. Felipe*,^[23] to cite a few, sustained the conviction of the accused despite the fact that the physical inventory and photograph of the illegal drug were not immediately done at the place where it was seized/confiscated. Moreover, contrary to Belban's view, the apprehending team offered a satisfactory explanation. Chumanao reasonably stated that they had a preliminary inventory of the seized items inside the car

because it was too dark at the time and they were being cautious of their own safety.[24] Similarly, Mosing said that they were not sure if there were other persons within the vicinity aside from the accused.[25] As to the apparent lack of any photograph at the scene of the crime, both Mosing and Asiong were uniform in claiming that they forgot to bring a camera in Kibungan.[26]

In *People v. Ros*,[27] We held:

Notably, Section 21 of R.A. No. 9165 serves as a protection for the accused from malicious imputations of guilt by abusive police officers. The illegal drugs being the corpus delicti, it is essential for the prosecution to prove and show to the court beyond reasonable doubt that the illegal drugs presented to the trial court as evidence of the crime are indeed the illegal drugs seized from the accused. In particular, Section 21, paragraph no. 1, Article II of the law prescribes the method by which law enforcement agents/personnel are to go about in handling the corpus delicti at the time of seizure and confiscation of dangerous drugs in order to ensure full protection to the accused.

x x x x

Section 21, however, was not meant to thwart the legitimate efforts of law enforcement agents. The Implementing Rules and Regulations of the law clearly expresses that "non-compliance with [the] requirements under justifiable grounds, as long as the integrity and the evidentiary value of the seized items are properly preserved by the apprehending officer/team, shall not render void and invalid such seizures of and custody over said items."

We likewise recognize that while the chain of custody should ideally be perfect and unbroken, it is not in reality "as it is almost always impossible to obtain an unbroken chain." Thus, non-compliance with Section 21 does not automatically render illegal the arrest of an accused or inadmissible the items seized/confiscated. As the law mandates, what is vital is the preservation of the integrity and the evidentiary value of the seized/confiscated illegal drugs since they will be used to determine the guilt or innocence of the accused.[28]

The illegal drug being the corpus delicti, it is essential for the prosecution to establish with moral certainty and prove to the court beyond reasonable doubt that the illegal drug presented to the trial court as evidence is the same illegal drug seized from the accused, tested and found to be positive for dangerous substance.[29] Here, the body of evidence adduced by the prosecution supports the conclusion that the integrity and evidentiary value of the subject marijuana were successfully and properly preserved and safeguarded through an unbroken chain of custody. Both the testimonial and documentary evidence indubitably show the following:

1. Immediately after the arrest of Belban and the seizure of the marijuana bricks, Ghumanao marked the illegal drugs and their containers in the presence of Belban and the other members of the buy-bust team.[30]
2. Abordo, to whom the buy-bust team turned-over the confiscated items upon its arrival in Camp Dangwa, conducted the inventory of all the seized items in the presence of the members of the apprehending team, Belban, and the representatives of the DOJ, the media, and the barangay.[31] The inventory sheet was signed by the DOJ, media, and barangay representatives.[32] Photographs of the proceedings were also taken.[33]
3. After the inventory, Abordo kept the non-drug items at the evidence room of Camp Dangwa, while he delivered the marijuana bricks with containers to the PNP Crime Laboratory.[34]
4. Canlas personally received the request for laboratory examination and the marijuana bricks.[35] Before actually conducting the physical, chemical, and confirmatory examinations, she scrutinized if the markings written in the letter-request were the same markings written on the specimens submitted and found out that they were the same.[36] She also placed her own markings on the seized items.[37] In her initial and final reports, she concluded that all the suspected illegal drugs were positive for the presence of marijuana.[38] She testified that

the cartons and plastic bags presented before the court were the same items, in the same condition, that were turned over to her for examination.[39]

5. Subsequent to the laboratory examinations, the marijuana bricks were turned-over by Canlas to Delos Reyes, who placed them in the evidence room for safekeeping until they were brought to trial upon court order. Delos Reyes testified that, at the time of turn-over, the items were in normal condition, in brick form, and no showing of tampering; that he went over all the markings on each brick, which were the same all throughout; and that the marked cartons and green plastic bags presented in court were the same ones containing the marijuana bricks at the time they were turned-over to him.[40]

Verily, the prosecution was able to establish with moral certainty and prove to the Court beyond reasonable doubt that there is an unbroken chain of custody over the confiscated illegal drug, from the time it was lawfully seized and came into the possession of the apprehending officers up to the time it was presented and offered in evidence before the trial court. The prosecution presented every person who touched the exhibit. They described how and from whom the seized marijuana was received, where it was and what happened to it while in their possession, the condition in which it was received, the condition it was delivered to the next link in the chain, and the precautions taken to ensure that there had been no change in the condition of the item and no opportunity for someone not in the chain to have possession of the same.[41]

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the July 23, 2013 Decision and October 9, 2013 Resolution of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CR-HC No. 05546, which affirmed in toto the February 28, 2012 Decision and April 24, 2012 Order of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 8, La Trinidad, Benguet, in Criminal Case No. 09-CR-7596, convicting appellant Belban Sic-open y Dimas of illegal sale of marijuana in violation of Section 5, Article II of Republic Act No. 9165, are AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

Velasco, Jr., (Chairperson), Perez, Reyes, and Leonen,[*] JJ., concur.

October 20, 2016

NOTICE OF JUDGMENT

Sirs / Mesdames:

Please take notice that on September 21, 2016 a Decision, copy attached hereto, was rendered by the Supreme Court in the above-entitled case, the original of which was received by this Office on October 20, 2016 at 1:55 p.m.

Very truly yours,

(SGD)

WILFREDO V. LAPITAN

Division Clerk of Court

[*] Designated Additional Member in lieu of Associate Justice Francis H. Jardeleza, per Raffle dated September 1, 2014.

[1] Penned by Associate Justice Celia C. Librea-Leagogo, with Associate Justices Franchito N. Diamante and Melchor Q. C. Sadang, concurring; rollo, pp. 2-29, 174-201.

[2] CA rollo, pp. 229-230.

[3] Records, pp. 365-374; id. at 65-74.

[4] Records, p. 391.

[5] Id. at 1.

[6] Id. at 39.

[7] However, Chumanao testified that they went back to the PDEA field office in Melvin Jones. (See TSN, March 23, 2010, p. 17).

[8] Records, p. 371; CA rollo, p. 71.

[9] Id. at 372-373; Id. at 72-73.

[10] Rollo, pp. 36-45.

[11] SEC 5. Sale, Trading, Administration, Dispensation, Delivery, Distribution and Transportation of Dangerous Drugs and/or Controlled Precursors and Essential Chemicals. - The penalty of life imprisonment to death and a fine ranging from Five hundred thousand pesos (P500,000.00) to Ten million pesos (P10,000,000.00) shall be imposed upon any person, who, unless authorized by law, shall sell, trade, administer, dispense, deliver, give away to another, distribute, dispatch in transit or transport any dangerous drug, including any and all species of opium poppy regardless of the quantity and purity involved, or shall act as a broker in any of such transactions.

[12] *People v. Dalawis*, G.R. No. 197925, November 9, 2015; *People v. Enad*, G.R. No. 205764, February 3, 2016; *People v. Dela Cruz*, G.R. No. 205414, April 4, 2016; and *People v. Amaro*, G.R. No. 207517, June 1, 2016.

[13] *People v. Dalawis*, G.R. No. 197925, November 9, 2015; *People v. Enad*, G.R. No. 205764, February 3, 2016; and *People v. Amaro*, G.R. No. 207517, June 1, 2016.

[14] TSN, March 23, 2010, pp. 20-24.

[15] TSN, June 22, 2010, pp. 10, 12-17.

[16] TSN, September 30, 2010, pp. 3-4, 16-17.

[17] *People v. Dalawis*, G.R. No. 197925, November 9, 2015; *People v. Enad*, G.R. No. 205764, February 3, 2016; *People v. Dela Cruz*, G.R. No. 205414, April 4, 2016; and *People v. Amaro*, G R No. 207517, June 1, 2016.

[18] See *Miclat, Jr. v. People*, 672 Phil. 191, 210 (2011).

[19] *Miclat, Jr. v. People*, supra.

[20] G.R. No. 206224, January 18, 2016.

[21] G.R. No. 198796; September 16, 2015.

[22] Supra note 18.

[23] 663 Phil. 132 (2011).

[24] TSN, May 18, 2010, p. 5.

[25] TSN, August 10, 2010, pp. 3-4.

[26] *Id.* at 6, 8-10; TSN, September 30, 2010, pp. 5-6.

[27] G.R. No. 201146, April 15, 2015, 755 SCRA 518.

[28] *People v. Ros*, *supra*, at 536-537. (Citations omitted) See also *People v. Flores*, G.R. No. 201365, August 3, 2015; *People v. Lara III*, G.R. No. 198796, September 16, 2015; *People v. Asislo*, G.R. No. 206224, January 18, 2016; and *People v. Dela Cruz*, G.R. No. 205414, April 4, 2016.

[29] *People v. Amaro*, G.R. No. 207517, June 1, 2016.

[30] TSN, March 23, 2010, pp. 15-17; TSN, May 18, 2010, p. 5; TSN, June 22, 2010, pp. 9-10; TSN, September 30, 2010, p. 12.

[31] TSN, October 20, 2009, pp. 8-9; TSN, May 18, 2010, pp. 5-7.

[32] Records, pp. 19-21

[33] *Id.* at 110.

[34] *Id.* at 13-15; TSN, July 13, 2009, pp. 4-6; TSN, October 20, 2009, p. 11.

[35] Records, pp. 13-15; TSN, July 13, 2009, pp. 4-6.

[36] TSN, July 13, 2009, pp. 5-6.

[37] *Id.* at 14.

[38] Records, pp. 27, 43-44.

[39] TSN, July 13, 2009, pp. 16, 24.

[40] TSN, October 20, 2009, pp. 4-6.

[41] See *People v. Enad*, G.R. No. 205764, February 3, 2016.

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.