

**\*\*Title:\*\***

Richard Ricalde vs. People of the Philippines (751 Phil. 793)

**\*\*Facts:\*\***

On January 31, 2002, in Santa Rosa, Laguna, Richard Ricalde was accused of raping a 10-year-old boy, XXX, by inserting his penis into the boy's anus while XXX was asleep. Ricalde, who was a distant relative and textmate of the victim, had been invited to stay the night at XXX's house by his mother. That night, XXX and Ricalde slept separately in the living room. Around 2:00 a.m., XXX awoke feeling pain in his stomach and anus and noticed Ricalde fondling his penis. He immediately reported the incident to his mother, who confronted Ricalde with a knife before escorting her son to the barangay hall and then to the police station. A medical examination revealed no recent trauma to the anal orifice and no trace of spermatozoa. Despite the lack of physical evidence, Ricalde was charged with rape through sexual assault.

**\*\*Procedural Posture:\*\***

1. **\*\*Arraignment and Pre-Trial:\*\*** Ricalde pleaded not guilty during his arraignment on August 21, 2002.
2. **\*\*Trial Court Proceedings:\*\*** The prosecution relied on the testimonies of the victim, his mother, and the medico-legal officer. The defense presented Ricalde's testimony denying the accusations.
3. **\*\*Regional Trial Court (RTC):\*\*** On June 20, 2011, the RTC found Ricalde guilty of rape through sexual assault, sentencing him to imprisonment ranging from four years, two months, and one day to eight years. The court also awarded P50,000.00 each in moral and civil damages to the victim.
4. **\*\*Court of Appeals (CA):\*\*** On August 28, 2013, the CA affirmed the RTC's decision but reduced the damages to P30,000.00 each for civil indemnity and moral damages, both with legal interest until fully paid.
5. **\*\*Supreme Court (SC):\*\*** Ricalde filed a Petition for Review, raising issues such as the credibility of the victim's testimony and absence of physical evidence.

**\*\*Issues:\*\***

1. Whether the prosecution proved beyond reasonable doubt that Ricalde committed rape through sexual assault.

2. Whether inconsistencies in the victim's testimony created reasonable doubt.
3. Whether the absence of physical signs of trauma and spermatozoa negates the rape claim.
4. Applicability of the "variance doctrine" to convict for the lesser offense of acts of lasciviousness.

**\*\*Court's Decision:\*\***

1. **\*\*Testimony Credibility:\*\*** The SC upheld the victim's testimony as credible and convincing. Consistent with jurisprudence, the court placed a high value on the straightforward and sincere account of the child victim, who had no motive to falsely accuse Ricalde.
2. **\*\*Inconsistencies:\*\*** While recognizing some inconsistencies in the victim's recount, the SC emphasized that minor inconsistencies do not discredit the witness's overall credibility, especially when the victim is a minor recalling traumatic events.
3. **\*\*Medical Evidence:\*\*** The SC noted that absence of physical signs of trauma and spermatozoa does not negate the occurrence of rape. Expert testimony explained the flexibility of the sphincter and its ability to resist trauma, aligning with the negative findings during the medico-legal examination.
4. **\*\*Application of the "Variance Doctrine":\*\*** The SC rejected the petitioner's claim for conviction under acts of lasciviousness, emphasizing that the essential elements of rape through sexual assault, such as the insertion into the anal orifice, were clearly established beyond reasonable doubt.

**\*\*Doctrine:\*\***

1. **\*\*Credibility of Minor Testimonies:\*\*** Testimonies by child victims are given full weight and credit due to their general truthfulness and sincerity.
2. **\*\*Rape through Sexual Assault:\*\*** Defined under Article 266-A of the Revised Penal Code. Even the slightest penetration or contact with the orifice is sufficient to consummate the crime.
3. **\*\*Medical Evidence:\*\*** The absence of trauma or spermatozoa is not decisive in rape cases; credible testimony of the victim alone is sufficient for conviction.

**\*\*Class Notes:\*\***

- **\*\*Elements of Rape through Sexual Assault\*\*** - Insertive act (penis, object, or instrument) into anatomical orifice.

- **Credible Testimony Weight** - Child victims' testimonies are highly valued.
- **Medical Examination role** - Non-indispensable and merely corroborative.
- **Variance Doctrine** - Conviction depends on allegations and proofs aligning with charges in the Information.

—

**Historical Background:**

The case arises within the context of evolving judicial understanding of sexual assault, recognizing that men and boys can also be rape victims. The Anti-Rape Law of 1997 (RA No. 8353) expanded the definition to include gender-neutral provisions, allowing legal redress for a broader spectrum of sexual violence instances. This case underlines the judiciary's role in interpreting these updated legislations and applying them to uphold justice for all genders.