

## THIRD DIVISION

[ G.R. NO. 176349, July 10, 2007 ]

**PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, APPELLEE, VS. ORLANDO UBIÑA Y AGGALUT, APPELLANT.**

### ***DECISION***

**YNARES-SANTIAGO, J.:**

For review is the Decision<sup>[1]</sup> of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CR No. 00012, which affirmed with modification the August 6, 2003 Decision<sup>[2]</sup> of the Regional Trial Court of Tuao, Cagayan, Branch 11 in Criminal Case No. 895-T, finding appellant Orlando Ubiña y Aggalut guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of rape.

On December 18, 2000, appellant was charged with rape in an Information<sup>[3]</sup> that reads:

The undersigned 2<sup>nd</sup> Assistant Provincial Prosecutor, Officer-In-Charge hereby accuses Orlando A. Ubiña of the crime of Rape, defined and penalized under Article 335 of the Revised Penal Code, as amended by Republic Act 7659, and Section 2, of Republic Act 8353, committed as follows:

That on or about October 16, 2000, in the Municipality of Sto. Nino, Province of Cagayan, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the said accused, [Or]lando A. Ubiña, uncle of the offended party AAA, thus, have moral ascendancy over the aforesaid complainant, with lewd design and by the use of force and intimidation, did, then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously have sexual intercourse with the offended party, AAA, a minor 15 years of age against her will.

Contrary to law.<sup>[4]</sup>

Appellant pleaded not guilty to the offense charged.<sup>[5]</sup>

The facts as culled from the records are as follows:

The series of events that led to the charge of rape started in the morning of October 9, 2000 when the appellant went to the Tabang Elementary School in Tabang, Sto. Niño, Cagayan (where AAA was a student) to inform her that her grandfather ("lolo") was in a hospital and needed her there. AAA went with the appellant but was told while at Tuguegarao that her lolo was in a different hospital. The appellant then brought her to Allacapan, Cagayan "in a house where the accused stayed when they were still young."

In a room at that house, the appellant removed AAA's pants and thereafter inserted his penis into her vagina while AAA was lying down. AAA resisted when she was made to lie down and cried as the appellant removed her pants. The appellant sexually abused [her] five (5) times in the seven (7) days they stayed in Allacapan.

From Allacapan, the appellant brought AAA in the afternoon of October 16, 2000 to her grandfather's house located in a rice field in Campo, Sto. Niño, Cagayan. He molested [her] twice at that location that same afternoon. Again, AAA cried as the appellant removed her shorts and panty.

After three (3) days, AAA's grandfather brought her home to San Manuel. With the appellant's warning not to tell anyone what transpired between them, AAA did not mention a word regarding the incident to either her grandfather at Sto. Niño, or to [her] father upon her arrival at home at San Manuel. It was only on the following day that she told her father about her ordeal. AAA's father reported the matter to the police the next day.

After initial police investigation, AAA was brought to the Cagayan Valley Medical Center where Dr. Jeliza Alcantara medically examined her. The examination disclosed several hymenal lacerations in her genitalia, indicating that she was no longer a virgin. The Medical Findings state:

"Abdomen " flat, soft, normo active bowel sounds, non-tender

GUT 1½ Normal External Genitalia, admits 2 fingers with ease (+)  
multiple complete and incomplete old healed hymenal lacerations

x x x

The appellant denied that he raped AAA but admitted that his father-in-law instructed him on October 9, 2000 to bring AAA home from school because he (the father-in-law who is also AAA's grandfather) was sick. [She] was summoned because no one else was available to look after him. After bringing [her] home, he went to his farm to pick up his wife. The appellant denied that he brought AAA to Allacapan, Cagayan; he had no reason to go there since he didn't know anybody from that place. He further claimed that on October 16, 2000, he was at Maguiling, Piat, Cagayan to have his buffalo carabao vaccinated; he went home by 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon of that same day.

The appellant claimed that he could not think of any reason why AAA would accuse him of rape, and surmised that [her] father could be angry at, or at the very least envious of, him. He narrated that AAA's father did not receive any dowry from his father-in-law while he and his wife were given a carabao.<sup>[6]</sup>

After trial on the merits, the trial court rendered judgment, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, in view of all the foregoing, the court finds that the guilt of the accused Orlando A. Ubiña for the crime of Rape, defined and penalized under Article 266-B of the Revised Penal Code has been established beyond reasonable doubt and hereby sentences the said accused Orlando A. Ubiña to suffer imprisonment of thirty (30) years of *Reclusion Perpetua*. He is further sentenced to indemnify the private complainant AAA the amount of P50,000.00 as civil indemnity.

No pronouncement as to cost.

SO ORDERED.<sup>[7]</sup>

On appeal, the Court of Appeals affirmed with modification the Decision of the trial court, thus:

WHEREFORE, the decision of the Regional Trial Court of Tuao, Cagayan, Branch 11, in Criminal Case No. 895-T, finding the appellant guilty of the crime of rape is AFFIRMED with MODIFICATION with respect to penalty and the awarded damages. The appellant is sentenced to suffer the penalty of *reclusion perpetua* and to pay the complainant P50,000.00 as moral damages and, as awarded by the trial court, P50,000.00 as civil indemnity. No pronouncement as to costs.

SO ORDERED.<sup>[8]</sup>

The appellate court disregarded the aggravating circumstance of craft and the special qualifying circumstances of minority and relationship of the parties in the imposition of penalty because it noted that they were not alleged in the information. It however modified the penalty of 30 years' imprisonment imposed by the trial court and instead imposed the single and indivisible penalty of *reclusion perpetua*. It also awarded the amount of P50,000.00 as moral damages.

Appellant denies raping AAA. He alleges that after he fetched AAA from school on October 9, 2000, he went to the farm to fetch his wife; that on October 16, 2000, he had his carabao vaccinated at Maguiling, Piat, Cagayan; that AAA's father fabricated the accusation against him out of jealousy because their father-in-law gave him and his wife a carabao as dowry, while the former and his wife were not given any; that the testimony of AAA was inconsistent and incredible - AAA cannot recall the place where the alleged first sexual abuse happened; and AAA's father, unlike other parents of rape victims, did not immediately report the alleged rape incidents to the police, nor did he confront him about what he allegedly did to his daughter. Finally, appellant invokes his right to be presumed innocent considering that the prosecution failed to prove his guilt beyond reasonable doubt.

The appeal is bereft of merit.

In reviewing rape cases, this Court is guided by three principles: (1) an accusation of rape can be made with facility and while the accusation is difficult to prove, it is even more difficult for the person accused, although innocent, to disprove; (2) considering the intrinsic nature of the crime, only two persons being usually involved, the testimony of the complainant should be scrutinized with great caution; and (3) the evidence for the prosecution must stand or fall on its own merit, and

cannot be allowed to draw strength from the weakness of the evidence for the defense.<sup>[9]</sup>

When a woman, more so if she is a minor, says that she has been raped, she says in effect all that is necessary to show that rape was committed. Youth and immaturity are generally badges of truth and sincerity. Also, in a long line of cases, we have held that if the testimony of the rape victim is accurate and credible, a conviction for rape may issue upon the sole basis of the victim's testimony because no decent and sensible woman will publicly admit being a rape victim and thus run the risk of public contempt unless she is, in fact, a rape victim.<sup>[10]</sup>

In the instant case, both the trial and appellate courts found AAA's testimony to be clear, convincing, and credible. In fact, records show that AAA properly identified her rapist and realistically depicted her harrowing experience in the hands of appellant:

Q Do you know the accused in this case?  
A Yes, sir.

Q Why do you know him?  
A My mother and his wife are sisters.

x x x x

Q Do you recall where were you at around 10:00 O'clock in the morning of October 9, 2000?  
A Yes, sir.

Q Where were you?  
A At Tabang Elementary School, sir.

Q At that particular date and time, do you still recall if somebody came to you?  
A Yes, sir.

Q Who was that person?  
A Lando Ubiña, sir.

Q Who is this Lando Ubiña, is he the same accused Lando Ubiña in this case?  
A Yes, the same person sir.

Q If he will be shown to you, will you be able to recognize him?  
A Yes, sir.

Q If he is now in the court room, will you please point at him?  
A There, sir (Witness pointed to a person who was asked his name and he answer [sic] that he is Lando Ubiña).  
<sup>[11]</sup>

x x x x

FISCAL:

Q Did you reach the hospital?  
A No, sir.

Q Where did you go then?  
A In Allacapan.

x x x x

Q While in Allacapan, do you recall if something happened to you?

x x x x

A He removed my short pants.

x x x x

COURT:

Q What did you do when Orlando Ubiña removed your pants?

A None, sir.

Q You did not object or refuse?

A I cried, sir.

FISCAL:

Q After the accused removed your shortpants, what happened next or what did he do next?

A He inserted his penis into my vagina.

x x x x

Q Did you resist when he made you lie down?

A Yes, sir. <sup>[12]</sup>

x x x x

Q On October 16, 2000, do you remember if there was anything unusual that happened to you?

A Yes, sir.

Q Will you tell what happened to you on October 16, 2000 at barrio Campo, Sto. Niño, Cagayan?

A He again removed my shorts and panty and sexually abused me again.

Q What did you do when the accused removed your shorts and panty?

A I cried again.

Q How many times on October 16, 2000 did the accused sexually abuse you?