



REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
SUPREME COURT
Manila

SECOND DIVISION

NOTICE

Sirs/Mesdames:

*Please take notice that the Court, Second Division, issued a Resolution dated **23 March 2022** which reads as follows:*

“G.R. No. 230125 (*People of the Philippines v. Macario Balagtas y Ola*). — This appeal¹ seeks the reversal of the March 1, 2016 Decision² of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CR-H.C. No. 06954, which affirmed the June 19, 2014 Judgment³ of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 10, La Trinidad, Benguet, finding accused-appellant Macario Balagtas y Ola (Balagtas) guilty beyond reasonable doubt of Illegal Sale and Illegal Possession of Dangerous Drugs as defined and penalized under Sections 5 and 11, Article II of Republic Act No. (RA) 9165,⁴ or the “Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002”.

The Antecedents:

Two separate Informations⁵ were filed against Balagtas for violation of Sections 5 and 11, Article II of RA 9165. The accusatory portions of which read:

For Criminal Case No. 10-CR-8151, in violation of Section 5, Article II, RA 9165:

That on or about the 9th day of July 2010, at Puguis, Municipality of La Trinidad, Province of Benguet, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, without being authorized by law, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and knowingly sell and deliver to Agent MICHAEL LANGWAS, a member of the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency

¹ *Rollo*, pp. 31-32.

² *Id.* at 2-30. Penned by Associate Justice Remedios A. Salazar-Fernando and concurred in by Associate Justices Priscilla J. Baltazar-Padilla (now a retired Member of this Court) and Socorro B. Inting.

³ *CA rollo*, pp. 13-18. Penned by Presiding Judge Edgardo B. Diaz De Rivera, Jr.

⁴ Entitled “AN ACT INSTITUTING THE COMPREHENSIVE DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT OF 2002, REPEALING REPUBLIC ACT NO. 6425, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT OF 1972, AS AMENDED, PROVIDING FUNDS, THEREFOR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.” Approved: June 7, 2002.

⁵ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8151), pp. 1-2; records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), pp. 1-2.

P/27

who acted as poseur-buyer, two (2) sachets of methamphetamine hydrochloride also known as “shabu”, a dangerous drug, weighing 0.09 and 0.10 grams each sachet with a total weight of 0.19 grams, in violation of said law.

CONTRARY TO LAW.⁶

For Criminal Case No. 10-CR-8149, in violation of Section 11, Article II of RA 9165:

That on or about the 9th day of July, 2010, at Puguis, Municipality of La Trinidad, Province of Benguet, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, without being authorized by law, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and knowingly have in his possession, control and custody one (1) sachet of methamphetamine hydrochloride also known as “shabu” weighing 0.10 grams, a dangerous drug, in violation of said law.

CONTRARY TO LAW.⁷

Balagtas pleaded not guilty during his arraignment on September 21, 2010.⁸ Pre-trial was terminated. Thereafter, trial on the merits ensued.

The prosecution presented the following witnesses: (a) Forensic Chemist Rowena F. Canlas (FC Canlas); (b) Intelligence Officer 1 Michael M. Langwas (IO1 Langwas); (c) Intelligence Officer 1 Randy Tindaan (IO1 Tindaan); and (d) Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) Agent Maydette Mosing (Agent Mosing).⁹ Whereas, the defense presented Balagtas himself as its witness.¹⁰

Version of the Prosecution:

On July 9, 2010, at around 11:00 a.m., an informant went to the PDEA Regional Office – Cordillera Administrative Region (PDEA Regional Office), and reported a certain “Macario” (later identified as Balagtas), who was engaged in the sale of dangerous drugs. IO1 Langwas interviewed the informant who divulged about Balagtas’ arrival at Baguio and La Trinidad from Manila, bringing with him *shabu* for sale in said places.¹¹

IO1 Langwas instructed the informant to send a text message to Balagtas inquiring if he was in Baguio and La Trinidad because there was a buyer of *shabu*. When Balagtas replied in the affirmative, IO1 Langwas asked the informant to call Balagtas in his cellphone. Over the phone, IO1 Langwas introduced himself as Lando, the buyer of *shabu*. Balagtas asked how much *shabu* he would buy, to which IO1 Langwas responded ₱2,500.00.¹²

⁶ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8151), p. 1.

⁷ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), p. 1.

⁸ Id. at 28.

⁹ Id. at 42.

¹⁰ Id. at 43.

¹¹ *Rollo*, p. 5.

¹² Id. at 5-6.

Subsequently, a buy-bust operation was organized. IO1 Langwas was designated as the poseur buyer, with Agent Mosing as the seizing officer, together with the team leader and two other officers as the back-up team. One genuine ₱500.00-bill and two ₱1,000.00-boodle bills marked with "MML" were prepared as the buy-bust money.¹³

At around 5:30 p.m., the informant relayed to IO1 Langwas a text message from Balagtas anent the meeting time at 6:15 p.m. and the meeting place in front of the gasoline station in Puguis, La Trinidad.¹⁴ At 6:10 p.m., IO1 Langwas, together with the informant and the team leader arrived and proceeded to the compound of the gasoline station. They walked towards a black pick-up vehicle and waited for Balagtas. Other members maintained their distance as if they were waiting for a jeepney.¹⁵ After few moments, Balagtas approached them. The informant introduced IO1 Langwas as the buyer. Balagtas asked for the money but IO1 Langwas insisted to see the *shabu* first. Balagtas handed two small plastic sachets containing a white crystalline substance, then IO1 Langwas gave the buy-bust money worth ₱2,500.00. IO1 Langwas made the pre-arranged signal by pulling the sleeves of his jacket.¹⁶

The buy-bust team immediately rushed towards them, arrested and informed Balagtas of his constitutional rights. Agent Mosing conducted a body search, and recovered the buy-bust money from the hand of Balagtas, one plastic sachet containing white crystalline substance, and a cellular phone from his pocket.¹⁷ IO1 Langwas marked the seized sachets with his initials MML and signature. They subsequently proceeded to the PDEA Regional Office where IO1 Langwas turned over the seized items to the evidence custodian IO1 Tindaan.¹⁸

IO1 Tindaan received three plastic sachets containing white crystalline substance from IO1 Langwas. The Inventory of Seized Items¹⁹ was prepared with the corresponding signatures of three witnesses: a representative from the Department of Justice (DOJ), a media representative from Bombo Radyo, and a barangay kagawad. Subsequently, IO1 Tindaan turned over the seized items to the crime laboratory for examination.²⁰

The Philippine National Police Regional Crime Laboratory in Camp Dangwa, La Trinidad, received the Request for Laboratory Exam²¹ and the seized items brought by IO1 Tindaan. Thereafter, FC Canlas conducted physical test, chemical test and confirmatory test of the three plastic sachets containing

¹³ Id. at 6.

¹⁴ Id.

¹⁵ Id.

¹⁶ Id.

¹⁷ Id. at 8.

¹⁸ Id. at 6-7.

¹⁹ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), pp. 14-15.

²⁰ *Rollo*, p. 7.

²¹ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), p. 18.

white crystalline substance. Per Chemistry Report No. D-40-2010,²² the tests yielded a positive result for the presence of methamphetamine hydrochloride.²³

Version of the Defense:

Balagtas testified that he worked as a truck helper since the 1990s. He had known a certain Jerson Cariño (Jerson) for three years, and they had more than a hundred trips together as truck helper and truck driver tandem. He always saw Jerson using *shabu* and even told the latter to stop engaging in such activity.²⁴

For that particular trip prior to his arrest, Balagtas, Jerson and a certain Henry were transporting products from Batangas to La Trinidad, Benguet. Since they were in a hurry, Jerson, the driver, could not get down the truck so he instructed Balagtas to get *shabu* from the individual standing at the side of Shell gasoline station near Balintawak Market. Jerson gave Balagtas ₱1,500.00 which the latter handed to the seller in exchange for plastic sachets of *shabu* contained in a cigarette pack. After the transaction, Balagtas went back to the truck and handed the cigarette pack to Jerson.²⁵ They arrived at La Trinidad at 6:00 a.m. of July 9, 2010. Jerson dropped off Balagtas at the boarding house of Edison, a friend of Jerson, so that Balagtas could sleep. Jerson told Balagtas that he would just return after breakfast to pick him up.²⁶

At around lunch time, Edison roused Balagtas from his sleep and told him that Jerson was waiting for him outside. Balagtas noticed a pick-up vehicle and saw Jerson wave at him. He proceeded to the vehicle and sat in front beside Jerson. The latter handed a cigarette pack to Balagtas so they could smoke. While Balagtas was getting a cigarette, a person stood by the window of Jerson, talked to the latter in an unfamiliar language, then sat beside Balagtas. A few moments later, another individual (later identified as IO1 Langwas) rode at the back of the vehicle and called their companions.²⁷ The person seating beside Balagtas told him not to resist because they were PDEA agents. They then frisked Balagtas, took his money, and asked for the *shabu*, to which Balagtas responded that he did not have *shabu*. The said individual then picked the cigarette pack from the dashboard, destroyed the pack, and saw the *shabu* inside. Balagtas pointed out that said *shabu* belonged to Jerson. When Balagtas asked Jerson what was happening, the latter responded, “*ganti ganti lang yan.*”²⁸

Balagtas was arrested and brought to Camp Dangwa. The PDEA agents then brought him to a hospital. The following morning, they offered breakfast and asked him to sign some documents. Balagtas was able to talk to a lawyer only after two months.²⁹ Balagtas averred that he and Jerson had a

²² Id. at 19.

²³ *Rollo*, p. 5.

²⁴ Id. at 9.

²⁵ Id.

²⁶ Id.

²⁷ Id. at 10.

²⁸ Id.

²⁹ Id.

misunderstanding where the latter blamed Balagtas for his arrest. Jerson, however, was not imprisoned because he paid ₱22,000.00. Balagtas thought that said misunderstanding was already resolved.³⁰

Ruling of the Regional Trial Court:

In its Judgment³¹ dated June 19, 2014, the RTC found Balagtas guilty beyond reasonable doubt for the offenses charged. First, the trial court concluded that Balagtas failed to overcome the presumption of regularity in the performance of official duties. The witnesses of the prosecution showed no ill motive to testify falsely against Balagtas whose defense was to merely deny and interpose frame-up. The positive testimonies presented by the prosecution prevailed over the defenses of Balagtas.³² In sum, the prosecution satisfied the quantum of proof of proof beyond reasonable doubt for Illegal Sale and Illegal Possession of dangerous drugs.³³

The dispositive portion of its Judgment reads:

1) For CRIMINAL CASE NO. 10-CR-8149 (Violation of Sec. 11, Republic Act [No.] 9165, possession of 0.10 gram of methamphetamine hydrochloride) – The accused Macario Balagtas y Ola is hereby found guilty beyond reasonable doubt for the crime of illegal possession of a dangerous drug under Section 11, Article II of R.A. No. 9165 otherwise known as the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002 and sentences him to suffer the penalty of twelve years and one day as minimum to seventeen years and four months as maximum of imprisonment and to pay a fine of THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND (P300,000.00) in favor of the government to be released to the PDEA in accordance with RA 9165.

2) For CRIMINAL CASE NO. 10-CR-8151 (Violation of Sec. 5, Republic Act [No.] 9165, sale of dangerous drugs) [–] The accused Macario Balagtas y Ola is hereby found guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the offenses of illegal delivery and sale of dangerous drugs under Section 5, Article II of R.A. No. 9165 otherwise known as the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002 and sentences him to suffer life imprisonment and to pay a fine of FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND (P500,000.00) in favor of the government to be released to the PDEA in accordance with RA 9165.

The three (3) heat-sealed transparent plastic sachets containing the illegal drugs or otherwise known as “shabu” being the effects of the crime, are hereby confiscated and shall be turned over to the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency-Cordillera Administrative Region to be disposed in accordance with the provisions of RA 9165.

SO ORDERED.³⁴

³⁰ Id.

³¹ CA *rollo*, pp. 13-18.

³² Id. at 16.

³³ Id. at 16-17.

³⁴ Id. at 18.

24/27

Aggrieved, Balagtas filed an appeal.³⁵

Ruling of the Court of Appeals:

In its March 1, 2016 Decision,³⁶ the appellate court denied the appeal of Balagtas and affirmed his conviction for Illegal Sale and Illegal Possession of Dangerous Drugs. It found that the prosecution adequately proved the elements for said offenses beyond reasonable doubt.³⁷ It disregarded the arguments raised by Balagtas with respect to the lack of his signature on the Inventory of Seized Items,³⁸ the location where the inventory took place,³⁹ the lack of photographs,⁴⁰ the discrepancy in weight reflected in the Inventory of Seized Items⁴¹ and in Chemistry Report No. D-40-2010⁴² pertaining to the estimate of weight and actual weight, respectively,⁴³ and the alleged ill motive on the part of PDEA agents.⁴⁴ Instead, the CA held that the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items have been preserved since every link of the chain was explained.⁴⁵

The decretal portion of the CA's Decision reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the instant appeal is DENIED. The assailed Judgment dated June 19, 2014 of the RTC, Branch 10, La Trinidad, Benguet in Criminal Cases Nos. 10-CR-8149 and 10-CR-8151 is hereby AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.⁴⁶

Unrelenting, Balagtas elevated the case on appeal.⁴⁷ Both parties, Balagtas and the People, manifested that they will dispense with the filing of supplemental brief, and that the discussions and arguments reflected in their respective Brief for the Accused-Appellant⁴⁸ and Brief for the Plaintiff-Appellee⁴⁹ will be adopted as part of their supplemental briefs.⁵⁰

Balagtas argues: (1) that the presumption of regularity in the performance of official duties is not conclusive;⁵¹ (2) that there was deliberate disregard of the procedural standards and safeguards provided under RA 9165 and no justifiable grounds were proffered by the prosecution;⁵² and (3) that the

³⁵ Id. at 20.

³⁶ Id. at 2-30.

³⁷ *Rollo*, pp. 19-24.

³⁸ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), pp. 14-15.

³⁹ *Rollo*, pp. 14-15.

⁴⁰ Id. at 15-16.

⁴¹ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), pp. 14-15.

⁴² Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), p. 19.

⁴³ *Rollo*, p. 16.

⁴⁴ Id. at 17.

⁴⁵ Id. at 27-28.

⁴⁶ Id. at 29.

⁴⁷ Id. at 31-32.

⁴⁸ *CA rollo*, pp. 31-58.

⁴⁹ Id. at 80-111.

⁵⁰ *Rollo*, pp. 38-43.

⁵¹ *CA rollo*, pp. 40-41.

⁵² Id. at 41-56.

per/20

prosecution's narration of events was dubious and puts into question the legitimacy of the buy-bust operation.⁵³

Conversely, the People contends that Balagtas was indeed guilty beyond reasonable doubt for the offenses charged because the prosecution established strong evidence pointing to his culpability.⁵⁴ Moreover, the chain of custody was observed and followed, hence, the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items were preserved in every link.⁵⁵ Finally, the trial court properly evaluated the credibility of the witnesses presented.⁵⁶

Issue

The principal issue before Us is whether Balagtas should be convicted for Illegal Sale and Illegal Possession of Dangerous Drugs.

Our Ruling

The appeal is meritorious.

It has been a long-standing principle in criminal cases that an appeal exposes the entire case for the reviewing tribunal's analysis and scrutiny, such that a judgment of conviction may be reversed into an acquittal, as in this case. *People v. Estonilo*⁵⁷ is instructive on the consequences of an appeal in criminal cases:

The appeal confers the appellate court full jurisdiction over the case and renders such court competent to examine records, revise the judgment appealed from, increase the penalty, and cite the proper provision of the penal law.⁵⁸

This Court, being the final arbiter, is mindful of the two-pronged requirement that must be observed in adjudicating drugs cases. First, the prosecution must establish all of the elements of the offense charged beyond reasonable doubt, otherwise the presumption of innocence remains in favor of the accused. Second, the chain of custody must be proven to have been complied with in order to justify the preservation of the integrity and evidentiary value of the *corpus delicti*.⁵⁹ Absent any of the two, a judgment of acquittal is warranted, as in this case.

While the prosecution cannot be discounted for its effort in establishing the elements of Illegal Sale and Illegal Possession of Dangerous Drugs pursuant to Sections 5 and 11, Article II of RA 9165, this Court finds and so holds that the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items have been compromised.

⁵³ Id. at 56-57.

⁵⁴ Id. at 89-98.

⁵⁵ Id. at 98-105.

⁵⁶ Id. at 106-109.

⁵⁷ G.R. No. 248694, October 14, 2020.

⁵⁸ Id., citing *People v. Bagumano*, 793 Phil. 602, 607 (2016).

⁵⁹ *Tolentino v. People*, G.R. No. 227217, February 12, 2020.

Section 21, Article II of RA 9165, prior to its amendment by RA 10640⁶⁰ on July 15, 2014, specifically provides:

Section 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;** (Emphasis Supplied)

Moreover, the Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) of said law laid down the saving clause in case of non-compliance with such procedure. There must be a justifiable reason for the failure to comply and it must be proven that the integrity and evidentiary value of the *corpus delicti* have been preserved. The particular provision of the IRR reads:

(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;** (Emphasis Supplied)

This Court holds that the prosecution failed to provide justifiable grounds for the few missteps committed in the course of Balagtas' apprehension.

First, the law requires the apprehending team to physically inventory and photograph the seized items in the presence of the accused or his representative among others. While it may be gleaned from the the Inventory of Seized Item⁶¹

⁶⁰ Entitled "AN ACT TO FURTHER STRENGTHEN THE ANTI-DRUG CAMPAIGN OF THE GOVERNMENT, AMENDING FOR THE PURPOSE SECTION 21 OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 9165, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE COMPREHENSIVE DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT OF 2002." Approved: July 15, 2014.

⁶¹ Records (Crim. Case No. 10-CR-8149), pp. 14-15.

that the three insulating witnesses signed the document, no signature of the accused or his representative was affixed thereon.⁶² This would have been inconsequential owing to the fact that the supposed signatory was unwilling to sign thereon. However, this non-compliance, when taken together with another two lapses, engender doubts on whether there was a genuine intention to abide by the standard requirements of the law. What is more, the required photographs were not presented as evidence despite their alleged existence, allegedly because the prosecution was not asked to produce the same. IO1 Tindaan testified as follows:

[ATTY. TABIN] You did not try to take the picture of this inventory, correct?

[IO1 TINDAAN] We have taken picture of that inventory in our office, sir.

Q But you did not mention it in your documents submitted in court?

A It was not asked, sir.⁶³

The non-inclusion of said photographs as part of the prosecution's evidence is not justified. *People v. Ferrer*⁶⁴ (*Ferrer*) elucidated:

Additionally, the prosecution was not able to prove that the seized items were inventoried and photographed in the presence of the accused-appellants and that copies thereof were furnished them. Indeed, **the records do not show any photograph depicting the confiscated items. Worse, the certificate of inventory was not even signed by the accused-appellants or their representatives which would only lend truth to the probability that, in actuality, the inventory was never done in their presence.**⁶⁵ (Emphasis supplied)

Similar with *Ferrer*, the records of this case revealed no photographs of the inventory and the inventory receipt was not even signed by Balagtas or his representative. Worse, there was also no Chain of Custody Form as part of the prosecution's documentary evidence. *Catimbang v. People*⁶⁶ emphasized the significance of the Chain of Custody Form to prove the faithful compliance with the chain of custody as required by law. Additionally, *People v. Honasan*⁶⁷ highlighted that the procedural lapse committed was aggravated by the lack of the Chain of Custody Form, thus:

This procedural lapse on the part of IO1 Estrellado is aggravated by the lack of chain of custody form in the records of this case. The form, if properly accomplished and made an integral part of the records of this case, could have assisted Us in identifying which sachet came from the appellant. Unfortunately, it appears that the police officers either failed to fill out a chain of custody form or the prosecution failed to present it in court.⁶⁸

⁶² Id. at 15.

⁶³ TSN, January 31, 2011, p. 16.

⁶⁴ 832 Phil. 527 (2018).

⁶⁵ Id. at 545.

⁶⁶ G.R. No. 247875, January 12, 2021.

⁶⁷ G.R. No. 240922, August 7, 2019.

⁶⁸ Id.

These lapses without rational justification on the part of the apprehending team or the prosecution leaves Us with no option but to acquit Balagtas. A justification of the lapses and proof that the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items have been preserved are necessary in order for the saving clause to operate. Absent these, the first link in the chain of custody was seriously compromised. Given this, it is no longer necessary to expound on the subsequent links. In fine, the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items having been compromised, Balagtas must be acquitted.

*People v. Dumanjug*⁶⁹ instructs:

Thus, the Court heavily enjoins the law enforcement agencies, the prosecutorial service, as well as the lower and appellate courts, to strictly and uncompromisingly observe and consider the mandatory requirements of the law on the prosecution of dangerous drugs cases. Otherwise, the malevolent mantle of the rule of men shall dislodge the rule of law. This cannot be allowed. Not while this Court sits.

WHEREFORE, the appeal is **GRANTED**. The assailed March 1, 2016 Decision of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CR-H.C. No. 06954 is hereby **REVERSED** and **SET ASIDE**. Macario Balagtas y Ola is hereby **ACQUITTED** for failure of the prosecution to prove his guilt beyond reasonable doubt. He is ordered to be **RELEASED** from detention immediately, unless he is confined for other lawful cause.

Let a copy of this Resolution be furnished to the Director General of the Bureau of Corrections, Muntinlupa City, for immediate implementation. The Director General is **DIRECTED** to report to this Court the action taken hereon within five days from receipt of this Resolution.

The Court **NOTES** the motion for early resolution dated January 3, 2021 of accused-appellant, assisted by Jose DL. Centeno, Jr., Paralegal Free Services Advocate, New Bilibid Prison-Maximum Security Compound, Muntinlupa City.

Let entry of judgment be issued immediately.

⁶⁹ G.R. No. 235468, July 1, 2019.

SO ORDERED.” (Perlas-Bernabe, S.A.J., on official leave; Hernando, J., Acting Chairperson per Special Order No. 2882 dated March 17, 2022)

By authority of the Court:

TERESITA AQUINO TUAZON
Division Clerk of Court

By:



MA. CONSOLACION GAMINDE-CRUZADA
Deputy Division Clerk of Court *pg 1/27*

27 APR 2022

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (reg)
134 Amorsolo Street
1229 Legaspi Village
Makati City

PUBLIC ATTORNEY’S OFFICE (reg)
Special & Appealed Cases Service
Department of Justice
5th Floor, PAO-DOJ Agencies Building
NIA Road corner East Avenue
Diliman, 1104 Quezon City

MACARIO BALAGTAS y OLA (x)
Accused-Appellant
c/o The Director
Bureau of Corrections
1770 Muntinlupa City

THE DIRECTOR (x)
Bureau of Corrections
1770 Muntinlupa City

THE SUPERINTENDENT (x)
New Bilibid Prison
1770 Muntinlupa City

HON. PRESIDING JUDGE (reg)
Regional Trial Court, Branch 10
La Trinidad, Benguet
(Crim. Case Nos. 10-CR-8149 & 10-CR-8151)

*JOSE DL. CENTENO, JR. (reg)
Paralegal Free Services Advocate
New Bilibid Prison-Maximum Security Compound
Muntinlupa City

JUDGMENT DIVISION (x)
Supreme Court, Manila

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE (x)
LIBRARY SERVICES (x)
[For uploading pursuant to A.M. No. 12-7-SC]

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ATTORNEY (x)
OFFICE OF THE REPORTER (x)
PHILIPPINE JUDICIAL ACADEMY (x)
Supreme Court, Manila

COURT OF APPEALS (x)
Ma. Orosa Street
Ermita, 1000 Manila
CA-G.R. CR HC No. 06954

*For this resolution only
Please notify the Court of any change in your address.
GR230125. 3/23/2022(64 & 97)URES(a)