

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 132321, January 21, 2002]

**PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS.
ALFREDO COSCOS AND JOHN DOE "ROEL MARCUJOS," ACCUSED-
APPELLANTS.**

D E C I S I O N

KAPUNAN, J.:

This case originated from an Information filed by Provincial Prosecutor Francisco G. Rivero against Alfredo Coscos and one John Doe, charging them with the crime of Murder, committed as follows:

That on or about October 31, 1995, in the Municipality of Maco, Province of Davao, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, accused Alfredo Coscos, conspiring, confederating and mutually helping with one John Doe, who is at large, with treachery and evident premeditation, with intent to kill, armed with a firearm, did then and there wilfully, unlawfully and feloniously attack, assault and shoot one Johnny de la Cruz, thereby inflicting upon him wounds which caused his death, and further causing actual, moral and compensatory damages to the heirs of the victim.

CONTRARY TO LAW.^[1]

Alfredo Coscos was arraigned on 11 December 1995 and pleaded "Not Guilty" to the accusation. John Doe was later on identified as Roel Marcujos and the Information was accordingly amended.^[2] However, while a warrant was issued for Marcujos' arrest, he was able to evade the authorities, and the trial proceeded against Coscos alone.

Belly de la Cruz, widow of the victim, testified for the prosecution. She recalled that on 31 October 1995, at around eight o' clock in the evening, while she was inside their bedroom and her husband was feeding their rabbits, she heard people throwing stones at their dogs. She peeped through a window and saw Alfredo Coscos, Coscos' son Ricky and Roel Marcujos entering their premises.^[3] Coscos, who was holding a kerosene lamp,^[4] shouted "Dong Johnny!" Her husband approached the trio. She next heard Coscos saying "Tan-awa ang tiil sa akong bata naghubag, tungod napaakan sa iro" (Look at the leg of my son, it swells because it was bitten by your dog).

An altercation ensued between the victim and Coscos. Suddenly, Belly heard a burst of gunfire and saw her husband staggering. She heard two (2) more shots and saw her husband fell about ten (10) meters away from where she was. She also saw Coscos holding a gun.^[5] Fearing that she would also be killed, she decided not to

make any noise.^[6] After Coscos and his companions left, she immediately asked for their neighbors' assistance^[7] and brought her husband to the Davao Regional Hospital where he was pronounced dead on arrival.^[8]

Belly de la Cruz further testified that her husband, prior to his death,^[9] earned about P15,000.00 per month.^[10] She likewise stated that for his farm animals, her husband earned about P150,787.79 for a year. To prove her allegation, de la Cruz submitted the following documents to the court: (1) a receipt, dated 15 September 1995, showing that from June to August 1995, her husband earned 8,162.25 from copra harvest; (2) a receipt, dated 07 December 1995, showing that her husband earned P13,820 from copra harvest ending November 1995; and (3) a letter from the Office of the Provincial Treasurer of Tagum, Davao showing that the deceased extracted about 5,716 cubic meters of gravel and sand from his quarry business from 01 January to 31 July 1995.^[11]

Finally, the witness testified that the total expenses she incurred for the wake of her husband, as well for the funeral service, memorial park and other expenses, amounted to P61,588.75.

Dr. Ricardo Rodaje of the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI), Southeastern Mindanao Regional Office, who conducted the autopsy examination on the cadaver of Johnny de la Cruz, testified that the cause of the death was gunshot wounds.^[12] The victim sustained three (3) wounds, found on the neck and on the head. Dr. Rodaje declared that while he recovered a slug on the victim's neck, he could not determine the kind of bullet used as he was not an expert on the matter.^[13]

Dr. Rodaje further testified that based on the entrance wound on the neck of the victim, he was shot while either standing or sitting down.^[14] He stated that the muzzle of the gun was a little bit lower than the entrance wound; hence, the gun could be at a lower angle in relation to the neck of the victim.^[15] The second wound, located on the left side of the victim's head, exited on the right portion of the head, which could mean that the victim was already lying prostrate when it was inflicted.^[16]

The witness also asserted that the entries of the wound were 5 x 1.3 cm. and 3 x 2.0 cm., which means that the assailant used a short firearm.^[17] However, he could not determine which wound was inflicted first.^[18] There was a possibility that both the assailant and the victim were standing and that the former was taller than the latter.^[19] Finally, Dr. Rodaje declared that powder burns could not be traced if the assailant was wearing gloves when the gun was fired.^[20]

The defense presented a number of witnesses to dispute the allegations of the prosecution.

Jacinto Cole testified that on 31 October 1995, at around eight o' clock in the evening, he heard three (3) gunshots.^[21] When he heard a fourth gunshot coming from Ambugan bridge, he left his house to investigate. Somebody told him that Belly de la Cruz needed a vehicle to bring her husband to the hospital.^[22] He went

to the house of the de la Cruzes and was told by Belly that Alfredo Coscos shot her husband.^[23] He was able to get a tricycle and he helped in bringing the victim to Davao Regional Hospital. However, Johnny de la Cruz was declared dead on arrival.^[24] In the hospital, he overheard Belly talking with the head nurse and saying that she was not certain if it was Alfredo Coscos who shot her husband although she had a strong suspicion because their dog bit Coscos' son.^[25] Cole, likewise, testified that the victim showed him his .38 caliber revolver, which he used to fire during nighttime.^[26]

Miguel Travenio, a kagawad of Barangay Dumlan, Maco, Davao, testified that on 31 October 1995, at about eight o'clock in the evening, he was in their house when he heard four (4) gunshots.^[27] However, he did not do anything because nobody reported to him.^[28] Later that night, at around ten o'clock in the evening, Alfredo Coscos went to his house and reported that an unidentified person wearing a black jacket shot Johnny de la Cruz.^[29] He recorded the report in the barangay logbook. Coscos was wearing a yellow sleeveless shirt.^[30] Leonel Ballispin and Alfredo Marcujos were in his house when Coscos arrived.^[31] Travenio further stated that the next morning, he, together with Barangay Captain Wilfredo Gonzales and some barangay officials went to the site of the incident.^[32] Travenio also maintained that the deceased told him that he was a military asset.^[33]

Leonil Ballispin corroborated the testimony of Travenio. He stated before the trial court that he was in the store of Kagawad Travenio when Coscos arrived to report that de la Cruz was shot.^[34]

Barangay Captain Wilfredo Gonzales asserted in his testimony that on 31 October 1995, at around ten o'clock in the evening, he was awoken by someone who told him that Johnny de la Cruz was shot by an unidentified assailant.^[35] He tried to contact the police station through an ICOM radio to report the incident but he was unable to do so. The following morning, Miguel Travenio apprised him of what transpired and he was told that it was Alfredo Coscos who reported the shooting.^[36]

The testimony of Police Inspector Leonardo Merced, Chief of Police of Maco, Davao, revealed that on 03 November 1995, he requested the PNP Crime Laboratory to examine Alfredo Coscos for the presence of powder burns.^[37] The accused tested negative for powder burns.^[38]

Judge Mary Anne T. Gonzales-Israel of the Municipal Trial Court of Maco, Davao was also called to testify for the defense. She handled the preliminary investigation of the case and recommended the filing of Information against Alfredo Coscos and John Doe. She recalled that sometime in December 1995, she received a letter addressed to Belly de la Cruz, which appeared to have been sent by a member of the New People's Army (NPA). The sender claimed responsibility for the killing of Johnny de la Cruz. The letter was mailed from Maco, Davao but she could not determine who the sender was.^[39]

Atty. Restituto Suelto, counsel for Alfredo Coscos, also testified that on 14 December 1995, he, too, received a letter similar to the one received by Judge Gonzales-

Israel. The letter came from a certain Vergel Montenegro who claimed to be a member of the Sparrow Unit of the NPA.^[40] Atty. Suelto claimed that a military intelligence officer informed him that Vergel Montenegro was indeed a leader of a Sparrow Unit.^[41]

The accused, Alfredo Coscos, declared before the trial court that he was at New Corella, Davao in the morning of 31 October 1995. He returned to Dumlan, Maco, Davao at around seven o' clock in the evening.^[42] Later, he and his eleven-year old son Ricky went to fetch water from the water pump located in the premises of Johnny de la Cruz.^[43]

Coscos recalled that as they were getting water, the de la Cruzes' dogs barked at them, prompting him to throw stones at the animals.^[44] Johnny de la Cruz approached them and he explained that he threw stones at the dogs because his son was bitten earlier that day. He even asked Johnny to look at the wound but the latter said they would discuss the matter the next morning.^[45] As Johnny was about to leave and he was about to pick up the pail of water, he heard a gunshot. He saw a person, wearing a black jacket, pumped two more gunshots at the victim. The assailant thereafter ran towards the creek.^[46] He and his son ran towards their house because they were afraid. They had dinner and later, he reported what he witnessed to Kagawad Travenio.^[47]

Coscos further testified that he went to New Visayas the day after the incident.^[48] Upon his return, he learned from his wife that the police were looking for him. He proceeded to the Maco police station where he was investigated and later, arrested.^[49] He was examined for powder burns but tested negative therefor.^[50]

The trial court found for the prosecution and in a decision, dated 05 May 1997, ruled as follows:

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, the accused is found guilty beyond reasonable doubt, and he is hereby sentenced to suffer the penalty of reclusion perpetua. He is further required to pay Belly de la Cruz the following:

1. P50,000 for the death of Johnny de la Cruz;
2. P50,000.00 for moral damages;
3. P68,588.75 for actual expenses;
4. P180,000.00 for the loss of the earning capacity of the deceased and to pay the cost.

SO ORDERED.^[51]

In his appeal before this Court, Alfredo Coscos faulted the trial court for his conviction and asserted that:

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN GIVING FULL FAITH AND CREDENCE TO THE SOLE EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT OF MRS. BELLY DE LA CRUZ.

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN NOT ACQUITTING THE ACCUSED ALFREDO COSCOS AS THE PROSECUTION FAILED TO ESTABLISH HIS GUILT BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT.

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN CONVICTING THE ACCUSED OF THE CRIME OF MURDER AS THE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCE OF TREACHERY WAS NOT DULY PROVED.^[52]

After a careful review of the records of this case, the Court finds no reason to reverse the conviction of accused-appellant Alfredo Coscos.

As a general rule, the trial court's evaluation of the testimony of the witnesses is accorded great respect and finality unless it is shown that it overlooked certain facts and circumstances of weight and influence which, if considered, would alter the result of the case.^[53] Here, accused-appellant failed to show that the trial court misinterpreted or misapprehended the evidence presented before it.

The widow of the deceased positively identified accused-appellant as the assailant. Thus, she testified:

Q On October 31, 1995 at about 8:00 o'clock in the evening, where were you?

A I was inside our bedroom.

Q How about your husband?

A He was outside, in the house of the rabbits.

Q What was he doing there?

A Feeding the rabbits.

Q Could you remember of any incident that happened at that time?

A On that time, I heard Alfredo Coscos calling my husband to look to the swollen foot of his son.

Q Before that incident happened, where did Alfredo Coscos come from?

A He was coming from their house and then went inside our premises.

Q How large is your fenced premises?

A It's big. More than 500 square meters.

Q How did you know that they are coming?

A Because of the barking of the dogs.