

**PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS.
EUSTAQUIO “TAQUIO” MORATA Y BIDOL,
ACCUSED-APPELLANT.**

G.R. Nos. 140011-16. March 12, 2001

Ponente: GONZAGA-REYES, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-nos-140011-16/>

GONZAGA-REYES, J.:

In a Decision dated July 28, 1999, the Regional Trial Court, Branch 63, Calabaga, Camarines Sur, convicted accused-appellant Eustaquio Morata (accused-appellant) of the two charges of rape out of the six rape charges filed against him by the victim, his sister-in-law, Marites Alamani (Marites). Accused-appellant now seeks exoneration from the two rape charges.

The two charges of rape for which accused-appellant was convicted are embodied in these Informations in Criminal Case No. RTC'98 220 and Criminal Case No. RTC'98 224, which respectively read as follows:

"INFORMATION

The undersigned 4th Assistant Provincial Prosecutor of Camarines Sur upon a sworn complaint of the offended party Marites Alamani accuses EUSTAQUIO "TAQUIO" MORATA Y BIDOL of the crime of RAPE, defined and penalized under Article 335 of the Revised Penal Code as amended by Republic Act No. 7659, committed as follows:

That during the month of April, 1997 at Barangay Antipolo, Municipality of Tinambac, Province of Camarines Sur, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, by means of force and intimidation, did then and there wilfully, unlawfully and feloniously have carnal knowledge with one Marites Alamani y Balimbing, an 11-year old (sic) minor, against her will and to her damage and prejudice.

ACTS CONTRARY TO LAW."[1]

"INFORMATION

The undersigned 4th Assistant Provincial Prosecutor of Camarines Sur upon a sworn complaint of the offended party Marites Alamani accuses EUSTAQUIO "TAQUIO" MORATA Y BIDOL of the crime of RAPE, defined and penalized under Article 335 of the Revised Penal Code as amended by Republic Act No. 7659, committed as follows:

That on the 9th day of June, 1997 at midnight at Barangay Antipolo, Municipality of Tinambac, Province of Camarines Sur, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, by means of force and intimidation, did then and there wilfully, unlawfully and feloniously have carnal knowledge with one Marites Alamani y Balimbing, an 11-year old (sic) minor, against her will and to her damage and prejudice.

ACTS CONTRARY TO LAW."[2]

Upon arraignment, accused-appellant pleaded not guilty. During trial, the prosecution presented Victoria Tagum,

a social worker of the Lingap Center, Sorsogon, Sorsogon who conducted counseling sessions with the victim and prepared the case study report; Marites, the victim herself; Dr. Salvador V. Betito, Jr. (Dr. Betito), the physician who examined the victim; and Maria Myrna Sarate, another social worker. The defense for its part presented accused-appellant himself, Salve Morata, the sister-in-law of accused-appellant and Shirley Abiog, who knows both accused-appellant and Marites.

The Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) recounts the version of the prosecution of the rapes allegedly perpetrated by accused-appellant against the then 11-year-old victim in this manner:

"Sometime in April 1997, about midnight, in appellant's house, private complainant was roused from her sleep by the former who was in the act of undressing her. She was gripped with fear. Appellant ordered her to keep quiet and she did not have a choice as he gagged her by putting a handkerchief in her mouth. Her moves were also restrained as appellant held her hands and lay on top of her. Appellant then inserted his penis into private complainant's vagina, causing pain in her genitalia. He warned her not to tell anybody about what had just happened. Then, appellant left private complainant, who was so scared. (TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 3-7). Little did she know that her harrowing experience would be repeated many times over within the next couple of months.

At a subsequent time, again about midnight in the house of appellant, private complainant was lying down when he approached her. He was holding an air rifle which he poked at her. Private complainant naturally got scared. After appellant undressed her and himself, he lay on top of her and attempted to insert his penis into her vagina. His sexual organ, however, touched only the outer part of her genitalia. Shortly, appellant left private complainant, crying in a corner. (TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 8-11).

At another time, private complainant was left home with appellant and his eldest child, Joey. Emma[3] left the house early in the morning of that day to bring her younger child to the physician. Appellant again attempted to force himself on private complainant but she was able to bite his ear causing him to stop what he was doing and leave. (TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 12-13).

There was also a time when appellant approached private complainant while she was cleaning the house. He lifted her, making her lie on the floor in a room. Both of them were wearing "shorts." Positioning himself on top of private complainant, appellant was in the course of removing her clothes, as he in fact had pushed down her "shorts" below the waistline. His dastardly act, however, was interrupted by Joey, who hit him at the buttocks with a coconut stalk. (TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 14-17).

Appellant subjected private complainant to his vile sexual designs on other occasions, the last sexual intercourse he had against her will occurring on June 9, 1997. It was then midnight when he took the liberty of entering the bedroom of private complainant and again forced himself on her. (TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 22-23)."[4]

Accused-appellant maintained that he did not rape Marites and interposed the defense of denial. On the alleged dates of the rapes, April 1997 and June 9, 1997, accused-appellant claimed that he went to sleep at 7:00 p.m. and wake up 6:00 a.m. the next day. Accused-appellant attributed to another person the rapes committed against Marites. Allegedly, it was Mariano Espartines, also a brother-in-law of Marites, who brought Marites to a grassy place and defiled her. Accused-appellant imputed ill motive on the part of Marites for filing the charges of rape against him. According to accused-appellant, he once spanked Marites after he found out that it was she who had tied a rope around his left ankle with the end of the rope tied to the post of the bed while he was asleep.

After trial, the court a quo rendered the now assailed decision the dispositive portion of which reads:

"WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, for failure of the prosecution to prove beyond reasonable doubt the guilt of the accused in Crim. Cases Nos. RTC'98-219, 221, 222 and 223, accused Eustaquio Morata is hereby

ACQUITTED of the offense charged. The prosecution having proven the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt in Crim. Cases Nos. RTC'98-220 and 224, the accused Eustaquio Morata is hereby found guilty of the offense of rape. He is hereby sentenced to suffer the following penalties:

- In Crim. Case No. RTC'98-220, he is sentenced to suffer the penalty of Reclusion Perpetua and to indemnify the victim Marites Alamani the amount of P50,000.00;
- In Crim. Case No. RTC'98-224, he is sentenced to suffer the penalty of Reclusion Perpetua and to indemnify the victim Marites Alamani the amount of P50,000.00;
- No pronouncement as to costs.

SO ORDERED."[5]

In this appeal, accused-appellant anchors his prayer for an acquittal on this lone assignment of error:

"THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FINDING THE ACCUSED GUILTY BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT OF TWO (2) COUNTS OF RAPE."[6]

Accused-appellant calls attention to the pronouncement of the trial court that he was charged with six counts of rape and was being acquitted of four and convicted of only two. Accused-appellant then argues that he should have been consequently acquitted of the two other remaining charges because Marites narrated only four of the alleged rapes. The following portions of the direct testimony of Marites supposedly proves his claim:

"Pros. Cu:

Q:

You have already told us at least 4 incidents which has (sic) a bearing in there (sic) cases. Marites Alamani, do you still have other complaints against Eustaquio Morata aside from these cases which you have already related?

A: No more, sir.

Pros. Cu:

That would be all, your Honor. (TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 18-19)"[7]

Accused-appellant limits his arguments in this appeal for the reversal of the assailed judgment of conviction to the foregoing premise. He concludes that his acquittal should have been forthcoming considering that there is no other remaining evidence against him.

The appeal is partially meritorious.

The testimonies of witnesses must be examined in their entirety and must not be merely selected to conveniently suit the claims of a party. In this case, while Marites narrated in her testimony only four of the six counts of rape, two of these four instances of rape she testified on included the rape incidents in April 1997 and on June 9, 1997 for which accused-appellant was convicted.

Admittedly, during direct examination, Marites was unable to recall the exact dates when the rapes occurred, except for the year, which is 1997. However, on cross-examination, she affirmed some portions of the sworn statements she had previously made, statements that pertain specifically to the rapes committed in April 1997 and on June 9, 1997. The confirmation of Marites in open court that the rapes happened in April 1997 and on June 9, 1997 weakens the contention of accused-appellant that these two charges are part of the four charges for which the trial court acquitted him.

More importantly, the trial court clearly set out in its decision the respective criminal charges for which accused-appellant was being acquitted and convicted. The trial court expressly declared that it was acquitting accused-appellant from the rape charges in Criminal Case Nos. RTC `98-219, 221, 222 and 223 on the ground that the prosecution failed to prove beyond reasonable doubt the guilt of the accused.[8] Equally categorical was the ruling of the trial court holding accused-appellant guilty of the rapes charged in Criminal Case Nos. RTC `98-220 and 224, the prosecution having proven beyond reasonable doubt the guilt of accused-appellant.[9] Criminal Case Nos. RTC `98-220 and 224 respectively cover the rapes that occurred in April 1997 and on June 9, 1997. Thus, accused-appellant cannot claim that the appealed cases are included in the four rape charges for which he was acquitted considering that Marites testified on the two rape charges now under review and the trial court made it quite clear as to which particular cases he was being convicted for.

In convicting accused-appellant, the trial court accorded great weight to the testimony of Marites. While the testimony of Marites is far from being perfect in all details, the imperfections tend to reinforce the unrehearsed character of her testimony. The fact that Marites consistently pointed to accused-appellant as the one who raped her undermines the defense of accused-appellant consisting merely of bare denial. Denial is an intrinsically weak defense which must be buttressed by strong evidence of non-culpability to merit credence.[10] Furthermore, between an affirmative testimony and a negative testimony, the former is considered far stronger than the latter, especially so when it comes from the mouth of a credible witness.[11]

Accused-appellant's attempt to ascribe ill motive on the part of Marites for filing the charges is a feeble one. It is inconceivable for Marites, a child victim, to have woven an intricate story of defilement if only to allegedly get even with accused-appellant for spanking her because of a prank she had played on him.

It bears stressing that when it comes to the issue of credibility, the trial court judge is in the best position to rule on this matter considering that he has the vantage point of observing first hand the demeanor and deportment of the witnesses.[12] In the absence of proof that the trial court had overlooked or disregarded arbitrarily certain facts and circumstances of significance in the case, as in the case at bar, its appreciation of the credibility of witnesses will not be altered on review.[13] It must also be pointed out that Marites was only twelve years old when she testified. We have held that when the offended parties are young and immature girls from the ages of twelve to sixteen, courts are inclined to lend credence to their version of what transpired, considering not only their relative vulnerability but also the shame and embarrassment to which they would be exposed by court trial if the matter about which they testified is not true.[14]

Based on the evidence on hand, the trial court correctly convicted accused-appellant of the first incident of rape that occurred in April 1997. The following portions of the testimony of Marites narrates the first incident of rape, viz:

"PROS. CU:

The purpose for which we offer the testimony of Marites Alamani is to prove that on several occasions she was raped by herein accused Eustaquio Morata your Honor. The first incident occurred way back in the month of April, 1997; the other incident your Honor, occurred in the year 1997 also but which the witness seemed to have not a good recollection as to the specific dates when this occurred but the witness had a vivid recollection of the last incident of rape against her which might have happened sometime June 1997, your Honor.

The present witness will also testify that force and intimidation attended the commission of the rape incidents your Honor. Lastly, your Honor, she will testify on all other points which are material to the main purpose for which we offer her testimony.

With the permission of the Honorable Court.

COURT:

Proceed.

PROS. CU:

Do you know Eustaquio Morata, Marites Alamani?

A: Yes, sir.

Q: Why do you know him?

A: He is my brother-in-law.

Q: And do you know Eustaquio Morata's wife?

A: Yes, sir.

Q: Who is the wife of Eustaquio Morata?

A: Ate Emma.

Q: How are you related to this Ate Emma?

A: She is my sister (sic) sir.

Q: Do you live with your Ate Emma sometime April 1997?

A: Yes, sir.

Q: Presently, Marites Alamani, under whose care are you now?

A: DSWD.

Q: Do you know the person of Victoria Tagum?

A: No, sir.

Q:

Do you know the Social Welfare officer who is in charge to (sic) you at the DSWD Center for Girls at Sorsogon?

A: Yes, sir. Mama Vicky.

Q: Do you know the real complete name of Mama Vicky?

A: No, sir.

Q: Marites Alamani, what is your complaint if any against Eustaquio Morata?

A: He undress (sic) me sir.

Q: And in what place did that happen Marites Alamani?

A: At our house sir.

Q: Where, exactly?

A: In Antipolo.

Q: Timambac, are your referring to that place?

A: Yes, sir.

Q: When this incident happened, was it in the morning, afternoon or in the evening?

ATTY. TAYER:

Objection. The question is leading.

COURT:

Sustained.

PROS. CU:

Q: What time was it in your estimate that this incident took place?

A: Midnight.

Q: This took place on April 1997?

ATTY. TAYER:

Objection, your Honor, leading.

COURT:

Sustained.

Q: When did this happen Marites Alamani?

A: I cannot remember anymore sir.

Q: What about the year, was it this year or last year?

A: Last year sir, 1997.

A:

(sic) Tell us Miss Marites Alamani, immediately before you were undress (sic) by Eustaquio Morata on that night, what if anything were you doing?"

A: I was sleeping sir.

Q: So, when you were undress (sic) by Eustaquio Morata, what if anything did he tell you?

A: He told me sir to keep quiete (sic) because my ate (sic) might be awakened.

Q: And what if anything did you feel when you were told that way?

A: I felt pain.

Q: Now, Marites Alamani, when you were being undressed (sic) by Eustaquio Morata what if anything did you feel?

ATTY. TAYER:

Make it of record that the witness find (sic) a hard time in answering the question.

A: I got scared sir.

PROS. CU:

Q: What if anything did Eustaquio Morata do after you were undressed already?

A: He placed himself on top of me sir.

Q: And when he placed himself on top of you (sic) was he still wearing his dress or not?

ATTY. TAYER:

Leading.

COURT:

Sustained.

PROS. CU:

Q: When Eustaquio Morata placed himself on top of you, what if anything did you do next?

A: He was (sic) inserting his penis into my vagina.

Q: Was he able to insert his penis into your vagina?

A: Only a little sir.

Q: What if anything did you feel when he has slightly penetrated his penis into your private organ?

A: It is (sic) painful sir.

Q: In what part is (sic) it painful?

PROS. CU:

I think the presence of Atty. Tayer is . . .

COURT:

The voice of the witness is very low, that is why Atty. Tayer is there.

WITNESS:

A: My vagina.

PROS. CU:

Q:

Now, why did you not shout Marites Alamani when accused Eustaquio Morata placed himself on top of you and inserted slightly his penis into your vagina?

ATTY. TAYER:

Objection, there is no basis. It is only presuming that the witness did not shout, when there is no testimony that she did not shout.

COURT:

Lay the basis.

PROS. CU:

Q:

When he undressed you and he placed (sic) on top of you, (sic) inserted his penis slightly into your vagina, did you shout?

A: I could not shout sir (sic) because there was a hankie placed on my mouth.

Q: Who placed that hankie on your mouth?

A: Eustaquio Morata, sir.

Q: Do you still recall how this hankie (sic) tied on your mouth?

A: Yes, sir.

Q:

Marites Alamani, using this hankie as a medium, please demonstrate to us how this hankie (sic) placed by Eustaquio Morata in your mouth?

A: The hankie was used to gag my mouth.

ATTY. TAYER:

Q:

As remembered by this representation, the witness just placed the folded handkerchief and placed it on her mouth parallel to the lips and while the handkerchief is being handled by the hands of the witness in the opposite direction.

PROS. CU:

Q: Was this handkerchief tied around your mouth and jaw?

ATTY. TAYER:

The handkerchief was tied around his ...

COURT:

Witness may answer.

WITNESS:

A: Yes, sir.

PROS. CU:

Q: Who tied it?

A: He, sir.

Q: What is the name of this person who tied this hankie on your mouth?

A: Eustaquio Morata, sir.

Q: How long do you think was Eustaquio Morata on top of you (sic) inserting his penis into your vagina?

A: Not very long sir.

Q: And did you cry?

ATTY. TAYER:

Objection, your Honor. Leading.

COURT:

Sustained.

PROS. CU:

Q:

What if anything was happening to you when Eustaquio Morata undressed you, placed (sic) on top of you and inserted his penis into your vagina?

A: I could not move because my hands were being held by him.

PROS. CU:

Q: And immediately before Eustaquio Morata left you, what if anything did he tell you?

A: That if ever I told anybody about what happened to me he will kill me.

Q:

Having been threatened by Eustaquio Morata that if you tell what happened to you on that night, he will kill you, what if anything did you feel when he said that to you?

A: I got scared sir.

Q: If Eustaquio Morata is around in court can you be able to identify him?

A: Yes, sir.

Q:

Please point at Eustaquio Morata whom you alleged undress (sic) you, placed (sic) on top of you and slightly inserted his penis into your vagina?

INTERPRETER:

Witness pointed to the person who when asked his name answered Eustaquio Morata."^[15]

True, Marites affirmed on cross-examination a portion of her affidavit wherein she stated that there was no penile penetration in the rape that took place in April 1997. However, Marites confirmed on direct examination that accused-appellant slightly inserted his penis into her vagina and that she felt pain. The affirmation of Marites on cross-examination that she had made said statements in her affidavit cannot prevail over her testimony in open court detailing the consummation of this first incident of rape. Sworn statements or affidavits are generally subordinated in importance to open court declaration because the former are often executed when an affiant's mental faculties are not in such a state as to afford the affiant a fair opportunity of narrating in full the incident which has transpired.^[16] More so in this case when the affiant is a child. It can be reasonably assumed that at the time Marites executed her affidavit she was not aware of the extent of the penetration; nonetheless, her straightforward testimony in court indicates that the rape passed the stage of consummation.

It is doctrinal that penetration, no matter how slight, or the mere introduction of the male organ into the labia of the pudenda constitutes carnal knowledge.^[17] Hence, even if the penetration in this case is only slight, the fact that Marites felt pain points to the conclusion that the rape was consummated.^[18] This conclusion is supported by the testimony of Dr. Betito, the medico-legal who examined Marites. Dr. Betito testified that Marites' vaginal

orifice easily admitted two fingers when it would have been difficult to insert a foreign object in the sexual organ of a girl her age. Based on these findings, Dr. Betito concluded that Marites has had sexual intercourse[19] and that she could have lost her virginity on the first incident of rape.[20]

However, we are constrained to acquit accused-appellant in Criminal Case No. RTC-98' 224, the case covering the last rape allegedly committed by accused-appellant against Marites on June 9, 1997. We have searched in vain for evidence to prove that accused-appellant defiled Marites on said date but the records simply fail to support a finding of conviction.

First, the testimony of Marites narrating the last incident of rape does little to establish the crime charged. Marites testified that accused-appellant was unable to undress her as Joey, her nephew, interrupted them and struck accused-appellant's butt with a coconut stalk.[21] When asked what happened next, Marites merely answered "No more sir".[22] Clearly, the precipitate interruption of Joey foiled the attempt of accused-appellant to rape Marites.

Second, we cannot convict accused-appellant for the June 9, 1997 charge of rape if the sole basis is the affirmation of Marites on cross-examination that she executed an affidavit stating that from June 1 to 9, 1997, accused-appellant entered her bedroom and repeatedly had sexual intercourse with her. What Marites merely affirmed was the fact that she executed said affidavit; however, to prove the guilt of accused-appellant beyond reasonable doubt for the June 9, 1997 rape of Marites, would require more than an affirmation. Nor can we inferentially conclude that the two other rapes narrated by Marites refer to the June 9, 1997 rape charge when Marites could not recall when these two alleged episodes of rape took place. To do so would amount to a conviction by conjecture.

We cannot over emphasize the basic tenet that in criminal cases, the prosecution has the burden of proving every element of the crime charged specifically carnal knowledge in rape cases. For the June 9, 1997 charge of rape, the failure of the prosecution to prove beyond reasonable doubt that accused-appellant had carnal knowledge of Marites on this specific date is fatal to the conviction of accused-appellant. We are precluded from ruling for a conviction when the evidence fails to support the specific allegations in the Information. True, time is not an essential element of the crime of rape.[23] However, the date assumes importance when it creates serious doubt on the commission of the rape or the sufficiency of the evidence for purposes of conviction, as in the case at bar.[24]

The conviction of accused-appellant for the April 1997 rape charge does not carry with it the penalty of death because only the minority of the victim was alleged in the Information while the relationship of accused-appellant with the victim was not alleged. The twin special qualifying circumstances of the victim's age and the relationship between the victim and the culprit are part of the seven modes of committing rape introduced by Republic Act 7659, the proper allegation of which would warrant the imposition of the death penalty.[25] For the rape to be qualified as heinous, both the circumstances of the minority of the victim and her relationship with the offender must be alleged in the information.[26]

The Office of the Solicitor General correctly pointed out that the award of damages by the trial court consisting only of civil indemnity in the amount of P50,000.00 for each count of rape is not in line with current rulings. Aside from the P50,000.00 civil indemnity, moral damages in the amount of P50,000.00 must be automatically granted in rape cases, separate and distinct from the indemnity.[27] Hence, in addition to the P50,000.00 indemnity awarded by the trial court in Crim. Case No. RTC-98' 220, Marites is also entitled to moral damages worth P50,000.00.

WHEREFORE, the appealed judgment is AFFIRMED insofar as it found accused-appellant Eustaquio "Taquio" Morata y Bidol guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of rape in Criminal Case No. RTC-98' 220, and

sentencing him to suffer the penalty of reclusion perpetua, but it is MODIFIED in that he is ordered to pay civil indemnity to Marites Alamani in the amount of P50,000.00 and another P50,000.00 as moral damages. Accused-appellant is ACQUITTED of the rape charged in Criminal Case No. RTC-98' 224 for the failure of the prosecution to prove beyond reasonable doubt the guilt of accused-appellant.

SO ORDERED.

Melo, (Chairman), Vitug, Panganiban, and Sandoval-Gutierrez, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 21.

[3] Emma is the sister of Marites and wife of accused-appellant.

[4] Rollo, pp. 114-117.

[5] Ibid., p. 47.

[6] Ibid., p. 79.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid., p. 47.

[9] Ibid.

[10] People vs. Sagun, 303 SCRA 382 (1999), p. 392.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., p. 391.

[13] Ibid.

[14] People vs. Clopino, 290 SCRA 432 (1998), p. 444-445.

[15] TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 4-8.

[16] People vs. Sanchez, 302 SCRA 21 (1999), p. 50.

[17] People vs. Ablog, 309 SCRA 222 (1999), p. 230.

[18] See People vs. Rafales, G.R. No. 133477, January 21, 2000.

[19] TSN, August 18, 1998, p. 10.

[20] Ibid., p. 4.

[21] TSN, June 26, 1998, pp. 17-18.

[22] Ibid., p 18.

[23] People vs. Ladrillo, 320 SCRA 61 (1999), P. 71.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Section 11. The death penalty shall also be imposed if the crime of rape is committed with any of the

following attendant circumstances:

- 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.
- When the victim is under the custody of the police or military authorities.
- When the rape is committed in full view of the husband, parent, any of the children or other relatives within the third degree of consanguinity.
- When the victim is a religious or a child below seven (7) years old.
- When the offender knows that he is afflicted with Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) disease.
- When committed by any member of the Armed Forces of the Philippines or the Philippine National Police or any law enforcement agency.
- When by reason or on the occasion of the rape, the victim has suffered permanent physical mutilation.

[26] See *People vs. Calayca*, 301 SCRA 192 (1999).

[27] *People vs. Garigadi*, 317 SCRA 399 (1999), p. 419.

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.