

**Title: Margarita Ambre v. People of the Philippines**

**Facts:**

1. **Initial Arrest and Charges:**

- On April 20, 2005, a buy-bust operation was conducted by the Caloocan Police targeting Abdulah Sultan and Ina Aderp for selling illegal drugs.
- During the operation, Sultan escaped, leading police officers to his house, where they found Margarita Ambre, Bernie Castro, and Kaycee Mendoza in a “pot session” using shabu.
- Ambre was charged with illegal possession of drug paraphernalia (Criminal Case No. C-73028) and illegal use of methylamphetamine hydrochloride (Criminal Case No. C-73029).

2. **Arraignment and Trial:**

- Castro and Mendoza pleaded guilty to the charges, while Ambre pleaded not guilty, leading to a trial on the merits.
- Prosecutors presented evidence, including testimonies of police officers and laboratory reports confirming the presence of shabu in urine samples and seized items.

3. **Defense:**

- Ambre denied the charges, asserting she was only in the compound to buy malong and was arrested unlawfully.
- Defense witnesses supported Ambre’s claim, suggesting she was arrested without cause.

4. **RTC Decision:**

- The RTC acquitted Ambre of the possession charge (Criminal Case No. C-73028) but found her guilty of illegal use (Criminal Case No. C-73029).
- Sentenced Ambre to six months of rehabilitation.

5. **Appeal to the CA:**

- Ambre appealed her conviction, which was upheld by the CA in its decision on November 26, 2009. Her subsequent motion for reconsideration was also denied.

**Issues:**

1. **Validity of Warrantless Arrest and Search:**

- Whether Ambre’s arrest and the subsequent search were valid without a warrant.

2. **Admissibility of Evidence:**

- Whether the evidence seized was admissible, considering their alleged illegal acquisition.

3. **Chain of Custody:**

- Whether procedural lapses in handling evidence affected the conviction.

4. **Testimonial Disregard:**

- If disregarding Mendoza's testimony violated the inter alios acta rule.

5. **Penalty Without Confirmatory Test:**

- Whether the penalty of rehabilitation was valid given the lack of a confirmatory drug test.

**Court's Decision:**

1. **Warrantless Arrest and Search:**

- The court held the warrantless arrest was valid under Sec. 5(a) of Rule 113, Rules of Criminal Procedure, which allows an arrest without a warrant when the person is caught in flagrante delicto.
- Since Ambre was seen actively using shabu, police were authorized to arrest and search her without a warrant.

2. **Admissibility of Evidence:**

- The court ruled the evidence admissible, emphasizing the established integrity and evidentiary value as laid out in the chain of custody requirements, despite some procedural lapses.

3. **Chain of Custody:**

- It was observed that the chain was sufficiently established. The integrity of the seized items was maintained per the facts presented and admitted lab reports.

4. **Exclusion of Testimonies:**

- The act of dismissing Mendoza's testimony was deemed proper, as the positive identification by officers overshadowed the denial defense.

5. **Validity of Penalty:**

- Ambre waived her objection to the penalty by not raising it at the trial court level.

**Doctrine:**

- The permissible instances for warrantless arrests include arrest in flagrante delicto, invoking Section 5, Rule 113.
- Proper chain of custody, although ideally unbroken, must focus on the integrity of the

seized items, establishing them as legitimate evidence.

- The principle of waiver applies when objections to procedural matters are not raised promptly.

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

- **\*\*Warrantless Arrest:\*\*** Section 5, Rule 113 of the Rules of Court outlines when a warrantless arrest is valid: in flagrante delicto, hot pursuit, and escaped prisoner situations.

- **\*\*Chain of Custody:\*\*** Critical but not rigidly unbroken; its primary goal is to preserve the evidentiary integrity.

- **\*\*Inter Alia Rule:\*\*** Testimonies outside the case's facts must show direct relevance or risk exclusion.

- **\*\*Waiver of Rights:\*\*** Failure to timely raise procedural issues can result in a waiver of those issues.

**\*\*Historical Background:\*\***

- This case emerged amid heightened enforcement of the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act (R.A. 9165) as part of the Philippines' ongoing struggle against illicit drug use and trafficking, marking the judiciary's role in sculpting legal precedents related to drug enforcement protocols.