



Republic of the Philippines
Supreme Court
Baguio City

FIRST DIVISION

NOTICE

Sirs/Mesdames:

Please take notice that the Court, First Division, issued a Resolution dated April 19, 2022 which reads as follows:

“G.R. No. 248601 (People of the Philippines, *Plaintiff - Appellee vs. Aniceto Dum Dumaya y Lee and Uba Tuban y Austria, Accused-Appellants*). – Before the Court is an appeal¹ from the Decision² dated April 16, 2019 of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CR-HC No. 08613. The CA affirmed with modification the Decision³ dated July 14, 2016 of Branch 54, Regional Trial Court (RTC), Manila. The RTC ruled as follows:

(a) In Criminal Case No. 14-308299, it found Aniceto Dum Dumaya (Dum Dumaya) and Uba Tuban (Tuban) (collectively, accused-appellants) guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of Robbery;⁴

(b) In Criminal Case no. 14-308300, it found Dum Dumaya guilty beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 28(e)⁵ of

- over – thirteen (13) pages ...

110-A

¹ *Rollo*, pp. 25-27.

² *Id.* at 3-23. Penned by Associate Justice Maria Filomena D. Singh and concurred in by Associate Justices Japar B. Dimaampao (now a Member of the Court) and Ronaldo Roberto B. Martin.

³ *CA rollo*, pp. 42-57. Penned by Presiding Judge Maria Paz R. Reyes-Yson.

⁴ *Id.* at 56.

⁵ SEC. 28. *Unlawful Acquisition, or Possession of Firearms and Ammunition*. – The unlawful acquisition, possession of firearms and ammunition shall be penalized as follows:

x x x x

(e) The penalty of one (1) degree higher than that provided in paragraphs (a) to (c) in this section shall be imposed upon any person who shall unlawfully possess any firearm under any or combination of the following conditions:

x x x x

Republic Act No. (RA) 10591,⁶ otherwise known as the Comprehensive Firearms and Ammunition Regulation Act;⁷

(c) In Criminal Case No. 14-308301, it found Tuban guilty beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 28(e) of RA 10591;⁸ and

(d) In Criminal Case No. 14-308302, it found Dum Dumaya guilty beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 3⁹ of Presidential Decree No. (PD) 1866,¹⁰ as amended by RA 9516.¹¹

The Facts

Accused-appellants were charged before the RTC under the following Informations:

Criminal Case No. 14-308299
([Robbery] versus [Dum Dumaya and Tuban])

“That on or about August 15, 2014, in the City of Manila, Philippines, the said accused, conspiring and confederating together and mutually helping each other, with intent to gain, and by means of force, violence and intimidation upon person, to wit: by then and there poking a gun upon one FRANIE CRUZ y PERIGRINA, while on board a tricycle and on a stop position along Tayuman corner Dagupan Streets, Tondo, this City, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously take, rob, carry away her shoulder bag containing cash amounting to Php2,000.00; Nokia Cellular Phone worth Php1,500.00, Postal ID and make-up kit, or (*sic*) all in the total amount of Php3,500.00, belonging to

- over -

110-A

⁶ An Act Providing for a Comprehensive Law on Firearms and Ammunition and Providing Penalties for Violations Thereof [Comprehensive Firearms and Ammunition Regulation Act], Republic Act No. 10591 (2013).

⁷ *CA rollo*, pp. 56-57.

⁸ *Id.* at 57.

⁹ Section 3. Unlawful Manufacture, Sales, Acquisition, Disposition, Importation or Possession of an Explosive or Incendiary Device. - x x x.

x x x x

¹⁰ Codifying The Laws on Illegal/Unlawful Possession, Manufacture, Dealing In, Acquisition or Disposition, of Firearms, Ammunition or Explosives or Instruments Used in the Manufacture of Firearms, Ammunition or Explosives, and Imposing Stiffer Penalties for Certain Violations Thereof and for Relevant Purposes, Presidential Decree No. 1866 (1983).

¹¹ An Act Further Amending the Provisions of Presidential Decree No. 1866, as Amended, Entitled “Codifying the Laws on Illegal/Unlawful Possession, Manufacture, Dealing In, Acquisition or Disposition of Firearms, Ammunition or Explosives or Instruments Used in the Manufacture of Firearms, Ammunition or Explosives, and Imposing Stiffer Penalties for Certain Violations Thereof, and for Relevant Purposes,” Republic Act No. 9516 (2008); *CA rollo*, p. 57.

said FRANIE CRUZ y PERIGRINA, against her will, to the damage and prejudice of the said owner in the aforesaid amount of Php3,500.00, Philippine Currency.

Contrary to law.”¹²

Criminal Case No. 14-308300

(Illegal Possession of Firearms versus [Dumdumaya])

“That on or about August 15, 2014, in the City of Manila, Philippines, the said accused, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and knowingly have in his possession and under his custody and control one (1) caliber .38 revolver marked as 'Smith and Wesson' with markings 'ADL 08-15-14' loaded with five (5) live ammunitions, without first having secured from the proper authorities the necessary license thereof (*sic*).

Contrary to law.”¹³

Criminal Case No. 14-308301

(Illegal Possession of Firearms versus [Tuban])

“That on or about August 15, 2014, in the City of Manila, Philippines, the said accused, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and knowingly have in his possession and under his custody and control one (1) caliber .38 revolver with Serial Number 146648 with markings 'UTA 08-15-14' loaded with six (6) live ammunitions, without first having secured from the proper authorities the necessary license thereof (*sic*).

Contrary to law.”¹⁴

Criminal Case No. 14-308302

(Illegal Possession of Explosives against [Dumdumaya])

“That on or about August 15, 2014, in the City of Manila, Philippines, the said accused, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and knowingly have in his possession and under his custody and control one (1) piece of hand grenade with markings 'ADL' 08-15-14, without first having secured from the proper authorities the necessary license thereof (*sic*).

Contrary to law.”¹⁵

Upon arraignment, accused-appellants pleaded not guilty to the respective charges filed against them.¹⁶

- over -

110-A

¹² As culled from the CA Decision, *rollo*, p. 6.

¹³ Id. at 6-7.

¹⁴ Id. at 7.

¹⁵ Id.

¹⁶ Id.

After pre-trial, trial on the merits ensued.

Version of the Prosecution

The prosecution presented as witnesses Police Senior Inspector Cristina Macagba, Senior Police Officer 1 Ronald Mesina (SPO1 Mesina), SPO2 Robert Carino, and private complainant Franie Cruz (Cruz),¹⁷ whose combined testimonies established the following:

At around 2:30 p.m. on August 15, 2014, Cruz boarded a tricycle at Tayuman corner Dagupan Street, Tondo, Manila. While the tricycle was on a stop position and waited for the traffic light to turn green, a male person (later identified as Dumdumaya) entered the tricycle, poked a gun at Cruz, and declared a “hold-up.” At gunpoint, Dumdumaya demanded that Cruz give her bag to him. After Cruz gave her bag, Dumdumaya immediately alighted from the tricycle and transferred to the nearby motorcycle driven by Tuban.¹⁸

At that time, SPO1 Mesina and Police Officer 3 Roy Dimaano (PO3 Dimaano) of the Western Metro Manila Investigation and Detection Team, Manila Police District were in the area conducting surveillance and monitoring. They noticed the incident involving accused-appellants. When they saw that accused-appellants were about to escape, the two police officers immediately approached them. They accosted accused-appellants and frisked them. SPO1 Mesina recovered from Dumdumaya the bag of Cruz, one .38 caliber gun with five live ammunitions, and one hand grenade. On the other hand, PO3 Dimaano found and seized from Tuban one .38 caliber gun. Thereafter, the two police officers brought accused-appellants to the Manila Police District Headquarters.¹⁹

Version of the Defense

For their part, accused-appellants admitted committing Robbery but asserted that they were framed up by Ariel Cortez²⁰ (Cortez) and SPO4 Obet Chua (SPO4 Chua). They alleged that Cortez is a *jueteng* collector and a trusted person of SPO4 Chua who leads gambling activities. Purportedly, Cortez told Tuban that SPO4 Chua needed

- over -

110-A

¹⁷ Id. at 7-8.

¹⁸ Id. at 4.

¹⁹ Id. at 4-5; see also CA *rollo*, p. 45.

²⁰ Referred to as Cortiz, Ortiz, and Cortex in some parts of the *rollo* (see *rollo* pp. 11 and 12).

persons to carry out a robbery against a woman who they believed was carrying ₱120,000.00 cash in her bag. Accused-appellants apparently agreed to participate in the plan.²¹

Accused-appellants further averred that they committed the robbery in the following manner: Tuban drove the motorcycle while Dumdumaya sat behind him; they tailed the tricycle that Cruz boarded; when the tricycle stopped before a traffic light, Dumdumaya alighted from the motorcycle, entered the tricycle, poked a knife at Cruz, and snatched her bag; thereafter, Dumdumaya returned and boarded the motorcycle driven by Tuban. At that point, several members of the Criminal Investigation and Detection Group accosted them.²²

The Ruling of the RTC

In the Decision²³ dated July 14, 2016, the RTC found accused-appellants guilty of the offenses charged.

The dispositive portion of the RTC Decision reads:

WHEREFORE, all premises considered, under Criminal Case No. 14-308299, accused Aniceto Dumdumaya and Uba Tuban are hereby found guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the offense of robbery. Considering that there is no qualifying circumstance proven and applying the Indeterminate Sentence Law, the two (2) accused are hereby sentenced to suffer the imprisonment of six (6) years four (4) months and one (1) day of *prision correccional* as minimum to eight (8) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor* as maximum. The period of their preventive detention shall be included in the computation of the service of his (*sic*) sentence.

They are, likewise, ordered to compensate private complainant Franie Cruz the amount of Three Thousand Five Hundred Pesos (P3,500.00) representing the value of the personal belongings taken from the private complainant with subsidiary imprisonment in case of insolvency.

Under Criminal Case no. 14-308300, accused Aniceto Dumdumaya is hereby found guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the offense of violation of Section 28 (e) of Republic Act No. 10591, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Law on Firearms and Ammunitions, and is hereby sentenced to suffer the imprisonment of ten (10) years, eight (8) months and 1 day to eleven (11) years and four (4) months.

- over -

110-A

²¹ CA *rollo*, pp. 42-58.

²² Id. at 47-48.

²³ Id. at 42-58.

Under Criminal Case No. 14-308301, accused Uba Tuban is hereby found guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the offense of violation of Section 28 (e) of Republic Act No. 10591 otherwise known as the Comprehensive Law on Firearms and Ammunitions, he is hereby sentenced to suffer the imprisonment of ten (10) years, eight (8) months and 1 day to eleven (11) years and four (4) months.

Under Criminal Case No. 14-308302, accused Aniceto Dum Dumaya is hereby found guilty beyond reasonable doubt (*sic*) Presidential Decree 1866 as amended by Republic Act 9516, he is hereby sentenced to suffer the imprisonment of *reclusion perpetua*.

The firearms, ammunitions and hand grenade subject of these cases are hereby forfeited in favor of the government. The Branch Clerk of this Court is hereby instructed to transmit the said firearms, ammunitions and hand grenade to the proper government agency for appropriate action.

SO ORDERED.²⁴

The Ruling of the CA

In the assailed Decision dated April 16, 2019, the CA affirmed the RTC Decision with modification as to penalty. The CA disposed of the case as follows:

WHEREFORE, the appeal is DENIED.

The Decision of Branch 54, Regional Trial Court of Manila dated 14 July 2016 in Criminal Cases Nos. 14-308299, 14-308300, 14-308301, and 14-308302 is AFFIRMED with the following MODIFICATIONS:

(a) In Criminal Case No. 14-308299, the indeterminate penalty of imprisonment shall be four (4) years and two (2) months of *prision correccional*, as minimum, to eight (8) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor*, as maximum; and

(b) In Criminal Cases Nos. 14-308300 and 14-3308301, the indeterminate penalty of imprisonment shall be eight (8) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor* in its medium period, as minimum, up to ten (10) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor* maximum, as maximum.

SO ORDERED.²⁵

Hence, this appeal.

- over -

110-A

²⁴ Id. at 56-57.

²⁵ Rollo, p. 22.

The Issue

Whether accused-appellants are guilty beyond reasonable doubt of Robbery; violation of Section 28(e) of RA 10591; and violation of Section 3 of PD 1866, as amended by RA 9516.

The Court's Ruling

The appeal is not meritorious.

The Court often stresses the following rule as regards the weight and respect given to the trial court's assessment on the credibility of witnesses, which finds application in the case:

x x x [T]he trial court's evaluation and conclusion on the credibility of witnesses are generally accorded great weight and respect, and are binding and conclusive or even accorded finality if affirmed by the appellate court. This is because the trial court has the first-hand opportunity to observe the demeanor of witnesses, placing it in the best position to assess their credibility. Unless there is a clear showing that certain facts or circumstances of weight, substance or value were overlooked, misapprehended or misappreciated by the lower court which could alter the result of the case, its factual findings shall not be overturned.²⁶

Accused-appellants are guilty of Robbery under Article 293 of the Revised Penal Code (RPC).

Robbery under Article 293 of the RPC has the following elements: (1) there is a taking of personal property; (2) the personal property belongs to another; (3) the taking is with *animus lucrandi*; and (4) the taking is with violence against or intimidation of persons or with force upon things.²⁷

The prosecution had established all the elements of Robbery. Accused-appellants, conspiring with one another, took personal properties belonging to Cruz after Dum Dumaya declared a "hold-up"; and at that time of the incident, Dum Dumaya pointed a gun at Cruz.

Notably, accused-appellants never denied and in fact, they readily admitted committing Robbery. However, both of them asserted that they were framed up. They pointed to a certain "Cortez"

- over -

110-A

²⁶ *People v. Bultron*, G.R. No. 253651 (Notice), October 4, 2021.

²⁷ *Nuylan v. People*, G.R. No. 247286 (Notice), January 13, 2021.

as the person who instigated and ordered them to rob Cruz.²⁸ Obviously, far from negating the commission of Robbery, accused-appellants' admission only bolsters the finding that they indeed committed the crime.

It must also be noted that accused-appellants did not present any evidence which would effectively taint with reasonable doubt the credibility of arresting officer SPO1 Mesina, or those of the other prosecution witnesses. Accused-appellants failed to prove and substantiate their allegation of frame-up. It remains a mere allegation. Both the lower courts gave credence to SPO1 Mesina's narration of the factual events. As often repeated, "the presumption of regularity in the performance of official duty, as well as the findings of the trial court on the credibility of witnesses, shall prevail over the accused's self-serving and uncorroborated claim of frame up."²⁹ Thus, the presumption that the police officers had regularly performed their official duties in the case should be upheld.

*Accused-appellants are guilty
of violation of Section 28 of RA
10591.*

In the prosecution of the offense of Illegal Possession of Firearms, the prosecution must prove the following elements: (a) the existence of the subject firearm; and (b) the fact that the accused who possessed or owned the same does not have the corresponding license for it.³⁰ The *corpus delicti* in this offense is the accused's lack of license or permit to possess or carry the firearm.³¹

Here, the police officers caught accused-appellants *in flagrante delicto* in possession of the subject firearms. To recall, accused-appellants had just committed Robbery which SPO1 Mesina and PO3 Dimaano witnessed. As accused-appellants were about to leave on board a nearby motorcycle, the police officers immediately approached them. They frisked accused-appellants and recovered from Dum Dumaya a .38 caliber firearm loaded with five live ammunitions and a hand grenade; and from Tuban a .38 caliber firearm loaded with six live ammunitions. Records show that both

- over -

110-A

²⁸ *Rollo*, p. 11.

²⁹ *Liwanag v. People*, G.R. No. 249125 (Notice), April 26, 2021.

³⁰ *People v. Lumbab*, G.R. No. 252665 (Notice), March 18, 2021, citing *People v. Olarte*, G.R. No. 233209, March 11, 2019.

³¹ *Id.*

accused-appellants were not licensed or registered firearm holders of any caliber.³² Furthermore, the offense is qualified by the fact that the subject firearms seized from the persons of Dumdumaya and Tuban were loaded with five and six live ammunitions, respectively.

Accused-appellant Dumdumaya is guilty of violation of PD 1866, as amended by RA 9516.

To sustain a conviction for the offense of Illegal Possession of an Explosive Device under PD 1866, as amended, the following elements must be established: (a) the existence of the subject firearm or explosive which may be proved by its presentation or by the testimony of witnesses who saw accused in possession of the same; and “(b) the negative fact that the accused had no license or permit to own or possess the firearm or explosive which fact may be established by the testimony or certification of a representative of the Philippine National Police [PNP] Firearms and Explosives Unit that the accused has no license or permit to possess the subject firearm or explosive.”³³

As found by the lower courts, the prosecution was able to establish beyond reasonable doubt all the elements considering that: (a) Dumdumaya was found to be in possession of a grenade, as testified to by SPO1 Mesina; and (b) he was not licensed to possess it, as evinced by the Certification dated December 11, 2015 issued by the PNP Firearms Explosive Office.³⁴

Penalties

Under Article 294(5)³⁵ of the RPC, the penalty to be imposed for Robbery is *prision correccional* in its maximum period to *prision mayor* in its medium period. Moreover, Article 295 of the RPC specifies circumstances under which the offender may be punished by the maximum period of the proper penalty, *viz.*:

- over -

110-A

³² Certification dated August 4, 2015 issued by the Philippine National Police Firearms and Explosives Office, as culled from the CA Decision; *rollo*, p.16.

³³ *People v. Velasco*, G.R. No. 231787, August 19, 2019.

³⁴ *Rollo*, p. 18.

³⁵ ARTICLE 294. *Robbery with violence against or intimidation of persons — Penalties.* — Any person guilty of robbery with the use of violence against or intimidation of any person shall suffer:

x x x x

5. The penalty of *prision correccional* in its maximum period to *prision mayor* in its medium period in other cases.

ARTICLE 295. *Robbery with physical injuries, committed in an uninhabited place and by a band, or with the use of firearm on a street, road or alley.* — If the offenses mentioned in subdivisions three, four, and five of the next preceding article shall have been committed in an uninhabited place or by a band or by attacking a moving train, street car, motor vehicle or airship, or by entering the passenger's compartments in a train or, in any manner, taking the passengers thereof by surprise in the respective conveyances, or *on a street, road, highway, or alley, and the intimidation is made with the use of a firearm*, the offender shall be punished by the maximum period of the proper penalties. (Emphasis supplied)

The Court notes that the crime of Robbery was committed under one circumstance mentioned in Article 295. The robbery was consummated along the streets of Tayuman and Dagupan, Tondo, Manila with the use of a firearm. According to Article 295, the offenders shall be punished by the maximum period of the prescribed penalty in Article 294(5), or *prision mayor* in its medium period.

Applying the Indeterminate Sentence Law, in the absence of any mitigating or aggravating circumstance, the minimum penalty shall be within the range of the penalty next lower in degree which is *prision mayor* in its minimum period, or from six (6) years and one (1) day to eight (8) years.³⁶ The maximum of the penalty shall be within the range of the medium period of *prision mayor* medium, or from eight (8) years, eight (8) months and one (1) day to nine (9) years and four (4) months.³⁷

The CA imposed an indeterminate penalty of four (4) years and two (2) months of *prision correccional*, as minimum, to eight (8) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor*, as maximum, which is not within the prescribed range. Hence, the penalty to be imposed must be modified to six (6) years and one (1) day, as minimum, to eight (8) years and eight (8) months, as maximum.

As regards the charge for violation of Section 28(a) of RA 10591 in relation to Section 28(e)(1), the penalty is provided as follows:

Section 28. *Unlawful Acquisition, or Possession of Firearms and Ammunition.* — The unlawful acquisition, possession of firearms and ammunition shall be penalized as follows:

- over -

110-A

³⁶ *Amparo v. People*, 806 Phil. 297, 306 (2017).

³⁷ *Id.*

(a) The penalty of *prision mayor* in its medium period shall be imposed upon any person who shall unlawfully acquire or possess a small arm;

x x x x

(e) The penalty of one (1) degree higher than that provided in paragraphs (a) to (c) in this section shall be imposed upon any person who shall unlawfully possess any firearm under any or combination of the following conditions:

(1) Loaded with ammunition or inserted with a loaded magazine[.]

x x x x

The CA imposed the indeterminate penalty of “eight (8) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor* in its medium period, as minimum, up to ten (10) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor* maximum, as maximum”³⁸ in Criminal Case Nos. 14-308300 and 14-3308301 (for violation of Section 28(a) of RA 10591).

The Court modifies the penalty.

As provided under Section 28(a) of RA 10591, the penalty of *prision mayor* in its medium period shall be imposed upon any person who shall unlawfully acquire or possess a small firearm. Under Section 28(e) of the same law, the penalty of one degree higher than that prescribed under section 28(a) shall be imposed if the firearm is loaded with ammunition, as in the present case.

As mentioned above, the firearms confiscated from the persons of accused-appellants Dum Dumaya and Tuban were loaded with five and six live ammunitions, respectively. As such, the proper penalty to be imposed on them is that provided for under section 28(e) of RA 10591 – *prision mayor* in its maximum period – which is one degree higher than *prision mayor* in its medium period.

Prision mayor in its maximum period has a range of ten (10) years and one (1) day to (12) twelve years. Applying the Indeterminate Sentence Law, conformably with the rules on the application of penalties on offenses punishable by special laws, and in the absence of any mitigating or aggravating circumstance, the

- over -

110-A

³⁸ Rollo, p. 22.

Court sentences accused-appellants to suffer the indeterminate penalty of eight (8) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor* as minimum, to ten (10) years, eight (8) months and one (1) day of *prision mayor* as maximum.³⁹

With regard to the charge for Illegal Possession of Explosives, PD 1866, as amended by RA 9516, provides that the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* shall be imposed upon any person who shall willfully and unlawfully possess any explosive including, but not limited to, hand grenade(s).⁴⁰ Hence, the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* imposed by the CA is affirmed.

WHEREFORE, the appeal is **DISMISSED**. The Decision dated April 16, 2019 of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CR-HC No. 08613 is **AFFIRMED** with **MODIFICATIONS** as follows:

(1) In Criminal Case No. 14-308299, accused-appellants Aniceto Dum Dumaya y Lee and Uba Tuban y Austria are found GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of Robbery defined and penalized under Article 294 in relation to Article 295 of the Revised Penal Code and are sentenced to suffer an indeterminate prison term of six (6) years and one (1) day, as minimum, to eight (8) years and eight (8) months, as maximum;

(2) In Criminal Case Nos. 14-308300 and 14-308301, accused-appellants Aniceto Dum Dumaya y Lee and Uba Tuban y Austria, respectively, are found GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 28 (e) of Republic Act No. 10591 and are sentenced to suffer the indeterminate penalty of eight (8) years and one (1) day of *prision mayor* as minimum, to ten (10) years, eight (8) months and one (1) day of *prision mayor* as maximum; and

- over -

110-A

³⁹ *Liwanag v. People*, *supra* note 27.

⁴⁰ Section 3 of PD 1866, as amended, reads:

SEC. 3. *Unlawful Manufacture, Sales, Acquisition, Disposition, Importation or Possession of an Explosive or Incendiary Device*. — The penalty of *reclusion perpetua* shall be imposed upon any person who shall willfully and unlawfully manufacture, assemble, deal in, acquire, dispose, import or possess any explosive or incendiary device, with knowledge of its existence and its explosive or incendiary character, where the explosive or incendiary device is capable of producing destructive effect on contiguous objects or causing injury or death to any person, including but not limited to, hand grenade(s), rifle grenade(s), 'pillbox bomb', 'molotov cocktail bomb', 'fire bomb', and other similar explosive and incendiary devices.

(3) In Criminal Case No. 14-308302, accused-appellant Aniceto Dum Dumaya y Lee is found GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 3 of Presidential Decree No. 1866, as amended, and is sentenced to suffer the penalty of *reclusion perpetua*.

SO ORDERED.” *Dimaampao, J., took no part; Kho, J., designated additional Member per Raffle dated April 6, 2022; Gaerlan, J., on official leave.*

By authority of the Court:


LIBRADA C. BUENA
Division Clerk of Court

by:

MARIA TERESA B. SIBULO
Deputy Division Clerk of Court

110-A
JUL 19 2022

The Solicitor General
134 Amorsolo Street, Legaspi Village
1229 Makati City

Court of Appeals (x)
1000 Manila
CA-G.R. CR-HC No. 08613)

The Hon. Presiding Judge
Regional Trial Court, Branch 54
1000 Manila
(Crim. Case Nos. 14-308299 to 302)

Public Information Office (x)
Library Services (x)
Supreme Court
(For uploading pursuant to A.M.
No. 12-7-1-SC)

PUBLIC ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
Special and Appealed Cases Service
Counsel for Accused-Appellants
5/F, DOJ Agencies Building
NIA Road cor. East Avenue, Diliman
1101 Quezon City

Philippine Judicial Academy (x)
Supreme Court

Messrs. Aniceto L. Dum Dumaya & Uba A. Tuban
Accused-Appellants
c/o The Director General
Bureau of Corrections
1770 Muntinlupa City

Judgment Division (x)
Supreme Court

The Director General
Bureau of Corrections
1770 Muntinlupa City

UR



