

Title: People of the Philippines v. Guadalupe Zapata and Dalmacio Bondoc

Facts:

The case originated from a complaint for adultery filed by Andres Bondoc against his wife, Guadalupe Zapata, and her lover Dalmacio Bondoc. The complaint alleged that the two cohabited and engaged in repeated sexual activities from 1946 to March 14, 1947 (Criminal Case No. 426). Guadalupe pleaded guilty, receiving a sentence of four months of *arresto mayor*, which she served. Subsequently, on September 17, 1948, Andres Bondoc filed a second complaint for similar acts allegedly committed from March 15, 1947, to September 17, 1948 (Criminal Case No. 735). Defendants filed motions to quash the second complaint on February 21, 1949, claiming double jeopardy as a defense. The Court of First Instance of Pampanga agreed, quashing the second complaint on the basis that the acts constituted a continuous offense. The prosecution appealed the decision to the Supreme Court.

Issues:

1. Whether the defendants could be charged anew for acts of adultery between a distinct period considering the double jeopardy clause.
2. Whether the acts enumerated in the two separate complaints constitute a continuous offense or multiple separate offenses.

Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court reversed the trial court's decision, ruling in favor of the prosecution.

1. Double Jeopardy: The Supreme Court held that charging the defendants for distinct acts of adultery over different periods did not constitute double jeopardy. Each instance of carnal intercourse was a separate, consummated crime of adultery.
2. Continuous Crime: The Court found that the acts in question did not meet the criteria for being deemed a continuous crime, which involves a single criminal intent or purpose over a series of acts. Each act of adultery retained its individuality unless occurring within the same indictment or charge period.

Doctrine:

The Supreme Court established that adultery is an instantaneous and consummated crime, and each act of intercourse constitutes a separate offense. The concept of a continuous crime requires unity of intent and purpose across multiple actions, which was absent in this case.

Class Notes:

- Adultery in the Philippines is defined as when a married woman engages in sexual intercourse with a man not her husband, and each act constitutes a separate offense.
- The double jeopardy clause (Article III, Section 21, 1987 Philippine Constitution) prohibits a person from being prosecuted twice for the same offense; however, distinct acts of a crime may each constitute new offenses.

- Penal Code: Article 333 of the Revised Penal Code addresses adultery as a crime, specifying that it is consummated with each instance of sexual intercourse.
- The concept of double jeopardy ensures protection against multiple prosecutions for the same act but allows separate charges for separate acts.

Historical Background:

Set in post-World War II Philippines, a period marked by complex socio-legal changes and considerations of family and societal norms regarding marriage fidelity, adultery cases continue to be significant in Philippine jurisprudence, often reflecting the broader moral and ethical values within the community. The case reflects the judiciary's role in delineating personal offenses and the scope of penal law, particularly embodying evolving interpretations of marital rights and protections under Philippine law.