Republic of the Philippines SUPREME COURT Manila

EN BANC

ATTY. HOWARD M. CALLEJA, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252578

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ET.

AL.

Respondents.

REP. EDCEL C. LAGMAN,

Petitioner,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252579

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA,

ET. AL.,

Respondents.

MELENCIO S. STA. MARIA, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252580

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

_____X

BAYAN MUNA PARTY LIST REPRESENTATIVES CARLOS ISAGANI T. ZARATE, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252585

PRESIDENT RODRIGO DUTERTE, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

RUDOLF PHILIP B. JURADO, Petitioner,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252613

ANTI-TERRORISM THE COUNCIL, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

CENTER FOR TRADE UNION RIGHTS AND HUMAN (CTUHR),

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252623

HON. RODRIGO R. DUTERTE, in his capacity as PRESIDENT and COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

.____х CHRISTIAN S. MONSOD, ET.

AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252624

SECRETARY EXECUTIVE SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

represented by SANLAKAS, Marie Marguerite M. Lopez,

Petitioner,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252646

RODRIGO R. DUTERTE, as President and Commander-in-Chief of All the Armed Forces, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

FREE OF **FEDERATION**

WORKERS) FFW-NAGKAISA

herein represented by its NATIONAL PRESIDENT ATTY. JOSE SONNY MATULA, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252702

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

JOSE J. FERRER, JR.,

Petitioner,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252726

SECRETARY EXECUTIVE SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA,

ET. AL.,

Respondents.

-----х

Bagong Alyansang Makabayan (BAYAN) Secretary General RENATO REYES, JR.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252733

H.E. RODRIGO R. DUTERTE,

ET. AL.,

Respondents.

ANTONIO T. CARPIO, ET. AL., Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252736

ANTI-TERRORISM COUNCIL,

ET. AL.,

Respondents.

MA. CERES P. DOYO, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252741

SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA, in his capacity as Executive Secretary, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

X-----X

NATIONAL UNION OF JOURNALISTS OF THE PHILIPPINES, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252747

ANTI-TERRORISM COUNCIL, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

(-----)

KABATAANG
TAGAPAGTANGGOL NG
KARAPATAN represented by its
National Convener Bryan Ezra C.
Gonzales, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252755

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

ALGAMAR A. LATIPH, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252759

SENATE, represented by its President, VICENTE C. SOTTO, III, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

THE ALTERNATIVE LAW GROUPS, INC.,

Petitioner,

G.R. No. 252765

-versus-

EXECUTIVE SECRETRY SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA,

Respondent.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF WOMEN FOR REFORMS, INTEGRITY, EQUALITY, LEADERSHIP AND ACTION (GARBIELA) INC., ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252768

PRESIDENT RODRIGO ROA DUTERTE, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

BISHOP BRODERICK S PABILLO, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G. R. No. 252767

PRESIDENT RODRIGO R. DUTERTE, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

HENDY ABENDAN of Center for Youth Participation and Development Initiatives, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252802

HON. SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA, in his capacity as Executive Secretary and Chairperson of the Anti-Terrorism Council, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

-----Х

CONCERNED ONLINE CITIZENS represented and joined by MARK L. AVERILLA, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252809

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

Concerned Lawyers for Civil

Concerned Lawyers for Civil Liberties (CLCL) members RENE A.V. SAGUISAG, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252903

PRESIDENT RODRIGO ROA DUTERTE, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

X-----

LAWRENCE A. YERBO,

Petitioner,

-versus-

G.R. No. UDK1663

OFFICES OF THE HONORABLE SENATE PRESIDENT, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

BEVERLY LONGID, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252904

ANTI-TERRORISM COUNCIL, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW (CENTERLAW), INC., represented by its President, JOEL R. BUTUYAN, who is also suing on his own behald, ET. AL., Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252905

SENATE OF THE PHILIPPINES, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

MAIN T. MOHAMMAD, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252916

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY as represented by SALVADOR C. MEDIALDEA, ET. AL.,

Respondents.

MAGLAKING, SAN BRGY. CARLOS CITY, PANGASINAN KABATAAN SANGGUNIANG (SK) CHAIRPERSON MELUEL GIO FERNANDEZ CAYABYAB, ET. AL.,

Petitioners,

-versus-

G.R. No. 252921

RODRIGO R. DUTERTE, ET. AL.

Respondents.

REPLY To the Supplemental Comment

Petitioner by counsel, after having received respondent's Supplemental Comment dated August 24, 2020, on September 2, 2020, files this Reply and respectfully states:

Respondents did not respond to the submissions in the Petition 1. that the Warrantless Arrest and detention under the Anti-Terrorism Act is virtual Martial Law without the declaration of Martial Law, hence without the checks and balances attendant to Martial Law under the Constitution; the arrest and detention of persons is a judicial function belonging to the Judiciary and the Act erodes and removes the jurisdiction and authority of the judiciary to protect and enforce Constitutional Rights, viz:

"The Petitioner now comes to this Honorable Court for its consideration of the following submissions:

- a) Arrest without warrant imposes Martial Law without a declaration of Martial Law under the Constitution. And the Anti-Terrorism Act, in allowing warrantless arrest removes the checks and balances mandated by the Constitution were martial law is declared;
- b) Though the Anti-Terrorism Act does not expressly state, the right against illegal search and seizure stands to be violated while security forces are enforcing warrantless arrest;
- c) Warrantless arrest under Section 29 and detention of fourteen (14) days extendable to another ten (10) days, a total of twenty four (24) days, without criminal charges being filed encroaches and cancels judicial authority and jurisdiction to determine probable cause and the public prosecutor's power to establish a prima facie case."

X X X

"RELIEF SOUGHT

Arrest without warrant imposes martial law power without the declaration of martial law, and that removes the checks and balances from Congress, and the Supreme Court provided in Article VII, Section 18 of the Constitution.

The Anti-Terrorism Act removes judicial authority to issue warrants and replaces it with authorization from the Anti-Terrorism Council. Thereby removing check and balance and gives to the arresting officer, on mere suspicion, hearsay or no evidence, the discretion to make the arrest, arrest without warrant, thereby replacing the judicial authority to decide the probable cause and the public prosecutor's power to prove prima facie case.

Checks and balances are essential in a Republic, which is absent in the statute. The arrest and detention without a warrant is an entirely a process of an Executive Branch, authorized by the *Anti-Terrorism Council*, which is comprised of members of the Cabinet, all President's men of whoever is the incumbent President."

- 2. Respondents argue that the claim of Petitioner and other Petitioners of injury because of the provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act is merely speculative. The metaphor for the Act is a big boulder uphill directly above many houses downhill. According respondents, the persons in the houses downhill need not fear, take no moves until the boulder rolls crushing the houses. Equivalent to respondents' argument that the Petitioners need not fear the warrantless arrest and detention under the Act until arrested and detained without warrant.
- The arrest and detention of a person require a due process that needs the cold neutrality of a judge.

"This Court has repeatedly and consistently demanded the "cold neutrality of an impartial judge" as the indispensable imperative of due process. x x x" (Isagani A. Cruz, Constitutional Law, page 223 citing Javier v. Commission on Elections, 144 SCRA 194)

- 4. The warrantless arrest and detention of a person by the arresting officers authorized by the Anti-Terrorism Council or non-judicial persons are lacking in the cold neutrality of a judge.
- 5. Respondents' argument that there is a presumption of the constitutionality of the Act cannot hold in this case because the Anti-Terrorism Act has a patently unconstitutional provision:

- a. The arrest and detention of a person is a judicial action subject to be exercised with due process with the cold neutrality of a judge. The warrantless arrest at the initiative of the arresting officer, police, or military authorized by the Anti-Terrorism Council is a non-judicial process without the cold neutrality of a judge.
- b. The warrantless arrest and detention of persons under the Anti-Terrorism Act deprive the detainee of his constitutional rights of presumption of innocence, right to life, liberty, property, and dignity without due process of law.
- 6. "The participation" of the Courts in the warrantless arrest and detention under the Act is passive, if token, after the arrest and detention, and only to act on the request that the detention be extended to another ten (10) days so evidence can be gathered against the detainee.

"SEC. 29. Detention Without Judicial Warrant of Arrest. - ... "if it is established that (1) further detention of the person/s is necessary to preserve evidence related to the terrorism or complete the investigation; (2) further detention of the person/s is necessary to prevent the commission of another terrorism; and (3) the investigation is being conducted properly and without delay.

x x x"

Immediately after taking custody of a person suspected of committing terrorism or any member of a group of persons, organization or association proscribed under Section 26 hereof, the law enforcement agent or military personnel shall notify in writing the judge of the court nearest the place of apprehension or arrest of the following facts: (a) the time, date, and manner or

arrest; (b) the location or locations of the detained suspect/s and (c) the physical and mental condition of the detained suspect/s."

- 7. The United Nations urging countries to enact Anti-Terrorism Laws and the Human Security Law of 2007 are not arguments. Verily, the United Nations will not tolerate an Anti-Terrorism Law that violates the Constitution. Nor is the Human Security Law of 2007 that had none of the unconstitutional provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act be cited as an argument in favor of unconstitutional provisions of the Act.
- 8. The Act authorizes the Anti-Terrorism Council to automatically adopt the United Nations Security Council Consolidated List of designated individuals, groups of persons, organizations or associations designated and/or identified as a terrorist, one who finances terrorism or a terrorist organization or group. (Sec. 25) Thus, in addition to the United Nations List of Terrorist persons, groups, organizations, the Act would have a Philippine-designated terrorists, raising terrorism, a police matter, to the highest national concern up to the Secretaries of the cabinet in the Executive Branch.
- Respondents have acknowledged that the requirement of locus standi is procedural and will not stand in the way of important and substantial issues.

The constitutionality of the provisions of the statute is so important and paramount that it affects life, liberty, and property not only at present but in the future, while the law is enforced.

10. Respondents named certain Petitions allegedly not conforming to requisite form and substance. Those Petitions lacking in form and substance offer platforms that is to say litigation, so that this Honorable Court may act and resolve the important and significant constitutional issue of the infirmity of the Act that otherwise would not be up for decision by this Honorable Court. The Supreme Court, the entire judicial hierarchy are passive entities that can act only upon cases filed with the courts.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed of this Honorable Court that this Reply is admitted and considered by this Honorable Court in its deliberations and resolution of this Petition and the other Consolidated Petitions.

Other just and equitable reliefs are prayed for.

Respectfully submitted.

Quezon City for City of Manila, September 8, 2020.

CALLANTA ONGLENGCO & MOREÑO LAW PARTNERS

Counsel for Petitioner
Jose J. Ferrer, Jr.
Unit 601 Prince Jun Condominium
No. 42 Timog Avenue, Q.C. 1103
Telephone Number: 8370-1933
Email: C.O.M.partnerslaw@gmail.com

BY:

ERWIN C. ONGLENGCO

Roll No. 45344
IBP Lifetime No. 02540 / Q.C.
PTR No. 9264561 / 01-07-2020 / Q.C.
MCLE COMPLIANCE No. VI-0023423
(April 11, 2019)
Email: erwin_onglengco@yahoo.com

MARK ERWIN W. DELOS REYES

Roll No. 64501

IBP No. AR38346531 / (1-06-2020 / Q.C. PTR No. 9264445 / 01-07-2020 / Q.C. MCLE COMPLIANCE No. VI-0023347

(April 11, 2019)

Email: attymark@medrlaw.com

Copy furnished:

JOSE C. CALIDA

Counsel for the Respondents Office of the Solicitor General OSG Building, 134 Amorsolo St., Legaspi Village, Makati City 1229 Reg. Rec. No. 298-56-478 w/r.c.
Post Office: BP Postal Station

| September 2020

EXPLANATION

Service to respondents by registered mail due to time constraints.

MARK ERWINAW DE OS REYES

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

- I, KIM HAROLD R. MANALOTO, of legal age, Filipino, single, with office address at Unit 601 Prince Jun Condominium No. 42 Timog Ave., Quezon City after being duly sworn in accordance with law, depose and say: THAT-
- On 11 September 2020, I was tasked by Atty. Mark Erwin W. Delos Reyes to serve the Reply To The Supplemental Comment in the case entitled "Jose J. Ferrer, Jr. vs. Executive Secretary Salvador C. Medialdea, et. al., to:

JOSE C. CALIDA

Counsel for the Respondents Office of the Solicitor General OSG Building, 134 Amorsolo St., Legaspi Village, Makati City 1229 (By registered mail with return card)

I execute this affidavit to attest to the truth of the foregoing statements and for whatever legal purposes this may serve.

SEP 1 1 2020 N WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this day of September 2020 in Quezon City, Philippines.

KIM HAROĽĎ R. MANALOTO

Affiant

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before methis day of September 2020 at Quezon City, affiant exhibiting to me his LTO

Driver's License No. NOZ-39-032255.

Doc. No. 201 Page No.

Book No.

Series of 2020.

1 2020

BP No. AR38346531 /Q.C. PTR No. 9264445 /Q.C. MCLE No.V-0022993

Adm. Matter No. NP-126 601 Prince Jun Condominium 42 Timog Avenue, QC/83701933 REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES)
QUEZON CITY, METRO MANILA) S.S.

DECLARATION

I, AILENE G. BAENTO, hereby declare that the document hereto submitted electronically in accordance with the efficient use of Paper Rule is complete and true copy of the document filed with the Supreme Court.

AILENE G. BAENTO Admin. Officer September 11, 2020

SEP 1 1 2020

subscribed and sworn to before me on this _____ day of September 2020, affiant exhibiting her competent evidence of identity, to wit: SSS UMID No. 33-6212814-8 issued at Quezon City.

Doc. No. 167; Page No. 47; Book No. 1;

Series of 2020.

AKK ERWELY, DELOS REYES
DTARY PUBLIC FOR Q.C. (19-20)
ROII NO 64501
IBP NO. AR38846531 /Q.C.
PTR NO. 9264445 /Q.C.
MCLE No.V-0022993
Adm. Matter No. NP-126

601 Prince Jun Condominium

42 Timog Avenue, QC/83701933

Scanned with CamScanner