414 Phil. 68

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 124442, July 20, 2001]

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. ARMANDO COMPACION Y SURPOSA, ACCUSED-APPELLANT.

D E C I S I O N

KAPUNAN, J.:

Armando S. Compacion was charged with violating Section 9 of R.A. No. 6425 (known as the Dangerous Drugs Act of 1972), as amended by R.A. No. 7659, in an information which reads as follows:

> The undersigned accuses ARMANDO COMPACION y Surposa, Barangay Captain of Barangay Bagonbon, San Carlos City, Negros Occidental, of the crime of "VIOLATION OF SECTION 9, REPUBLIC ACT NO. 6425, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT OF 1972 AS AMENDED BY REPUBLIC ACT NO. 7659" committed as follows:
>
> > "That on or about 1:30 o'clock A.M., July 13, 1995, at Barangay Bagonbon, San Carlos City, Negros Occidental, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, without any authority of law, did, then and there, willfully, unlawfully and criminally plant, cultivate or culture two (2) full grown Indian Hemp Plants, otherwise known as "Marijuana plants", more or less eleven (11) feet tall, in gross violation of Section 9, Republic Act No. 6425, otherwise known as the Dangerous Drugs Act of 1972 as amended by Republic Act No. 7659."
>
> CONTRARY TO LAW.[1]

Upon arraignment on August 16, 1995, the accused pleaded not guilty to the crime charged.

Thereafter, trial ensued.

On January 2, 1996, the trial court convicted the accused of the crime charged. The decretal portion of the decision reads as follows:

> WHEREAS, the Court finds the accused ARMANDO COMPACION Y SURPOSA GUILTY BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT of the crime of "Violation of Section 9, R.A. No. 6425, otherwise known as The Dangerous Drugs Act of 1972, as amended by R.A. No. 7659" whereof he is charged in the information in the instant case and sentences him to reclusion perpetua and to pay a fine of half a million (P500,000.00) Pesos, Philippine Currency. The portion of the backyard of his residence in the poblacion proper of Brgy. Bagonbon this City and Province, in which

the two (2) marijuana plants, Exh. "F", subject-matter of this case, were planted, cultivated and cultured, is hereby ordered confiscated and escheated in favor of the State, pursuant to the aforequoted Sec. 13 R.A. 7659.

It would seem that the penalty imposed upon the accused in the instant case for having planted, cultivated and cultured just two (2) marijuana plants is extremely harsh. But there is nothing in the law which allows the Court to impose a lesser penalty in view of the peculiar facts and circumstances in this particular case. Hence, dura lex, sed lex. The law is, indeed, harsh but it is the law.

The obvious message of the law is that people should not have a nonchalant or cavalier attitude towards dangerous prohibited drugs. They should not dabble in it as if they were a flippant thing. These dangerous and prohibited drugs are a terrible menace to the minds and morality of our people for their distortive and pervertive effects on them resulting in rampant criminality. That is why the government wants this evil exterminated from our country. It is too bad that the accused instead of helping the government in this drive, in his capacity as barangay captain of his barangay, made a mockery of it by planting, cultivating and culturing said two (2) marijuana plants himself.

A word of counsel and hope for the accused. This is a time of reflection forced upon him by the result of his own act in violating the law. It is time for him to humbly submit to the compassion of God and of his only begotten Son, whose birth on earth to become the Saviour of all sinners, we have just celebrated, to change and transform his own life by his coming to Him for the purpose, so that with a changed life, God might be gracious enough to move the heart of His Excellency, the President, of this Country, to pardon and let him walk out of prison a freeman. It would be good for him to read God's Word daily while in prison for his guidance, comfort and hope.

Accused convicted of the crime whereof he is charged in the information in the instant case.

SO ORDERED.[2]

The accused now appeals from the above judgment of conviction and asks the Court to reverse the same on the following grounds, *viz*:

The lower court erred:

1. In holding that Exhibit "F" of the prosecution, consisting of two marijuana plants wrapped in plastic, is admissible in evidence against the accused as the corpus delicti in the instant case, inspite of the fact that the prosecution failed to prove that the specimens of marijuana (Exhibit "F") examined by the forensic chemist were the ones purportedly planted and cultivated by the accused, and of the fact that the prosecution failed to establish the evidence's chain

of custody; and

2. In holding that the warrantless search of the residence of the accused at 1:30 o'clock in the morning of July 13, 1995 at Barangay Bagonbon, San Carlos City, Negros Occidental, and seizure of two eleven feet tall, more or less, full grown suspected Indian Hemp, otherwise known as Marijuana plants, leading to the subsequent arrest of the accused, were valid on the ground that the accused has committed the crime of cultivating the said marijuana plants in violation of Sec. 9, RA 6425 (Dangerous Drugs Act of 1972), as amended by RA 7659 in open view, inspite of the fact that they had to enter the dwelling of the accused to get to the place where the suspected marijuana plants were planted, and in admitting in evidence the said plants, later marked as Exhibit "F", against the accused, inspite of the fact that the said plants were the fruits of the poisonous tree.[3]

The relevant facts are as follows:

Acting on a confidential tip supplied by a police informant that accused-appellant was growing and cultivating marijuana plants, SPO1 Gilbert L. Linda and SPO2 Basilio Sarong of the 6th Narcotic Regional Field Unit of the Narcotics Command (NARCOM) of the Bacolod City Detachment conducted a surveillance of the residence of accused-appellant who was then the barangay captain of barangay Bagonbon, San Carlos City, Negros Occidental on July 9, 1995. During the said surveillance, they saw two (2) tall plants in the backyard of the accused-appellant which they suspected to be marijuana plants.[4]

SPO1 Linda and SPO2 Sarong reported the result of their surveillance to SPO4 Ranulfo T. Villamor, Jr., Chief of NARCOM, Bacolod City, who immediately formed a team composed of the members of the Intelligence Division Provincial Command, the Criminal Investigation Command and the Special Action Force. Two members of the media, one from DYWF Radio and another from DYRL Radio, were also included in the composite team.

On July 12, 1995, the team applied for a search warrant with the office of Executive Judge Bernardo Ponferrada in Bacolod City. However, Judge Ponferrada informed them that he did not have territorial jurisdiction over the matter.[5] The team then left Bacolod City for San Carlos City. They arrived there around six-thirty in the evening, then went to the house of Executive Judge Roberto S. Javellana to secure a search warrant. They were not able to do so because it was nighttime and office hours were obviously over. They were told by the judge to go back in the morning. [6]

Nonetheless, the team proceeded to barangay Bagonbon and arrived at the residence of accused-appellant in the early morning of July 13, 1995. SPO4 Villamor knocked at the gate and called out for the accused-appellant. What happened thereafter is subject to conflicting accounts. The prosecution contends that the accused-appellant opened the gate and permitted them to come in. He was immediately asked by SPO4 Villamor about the suspected marijuana plants and he admitted that he planted and cultivated the same for the use of his wife who was

suffering from migraine. SPO4 Villamor then told him that he would be charged for violation of Section 9 of R.A. No. 6425 and informed him of his constitutional rights. The operatives then uprooted the suspected marijuana plants. SPO1 Linda conducted an initial field test of the plants by using the Narcotics Drug Identification Kit. The test yielded a positive result.[7]

On July 15, 1995, the plants were turned over to the Philippine National Police (PNP) Crime Laboratory, Bacolod City Police Command, particularly to Senior Inspector Reah Abastillas Villavicencio. Senior Inspector Villavicencio weighed and measured the plants, one was 125 inches and weighed 700 grams while the other was 130 inches and weighed 900 grams. Three (3) qualitative examinations were conducted, namely: the microscopic test, the chemical test, and the thin layer chromatographic test. All yielded positive results.[8]

On his part, accused-appellant maintains that around one-thirty in the early morning of July 13, 1995 while he and his family were sleeping, he heard somebody knocking outside his house. He went down bringing with him a flashlight. After he opened the gate, four (4) persons who he thought were members of the military, entered the premises then went inside the house. It was dark so he could not count the others who entered the house as the same was lit only by a kerosene lamp. One of the four men told him to sit in the living room. Some of the men went upstairs while the others went around the house. None of them asked for his permission to search his house and the premises.[9]

After about twenty (20) minutes of searching, the men called him outside and brought him to the backyard. One of the military men said: "Captain, you have a (sic) marijuana here at your backyard" to which accused-appellant replied: "I do not know that they were (sic) marijuana plants but what I know is that they are medicinal plants for my wife" who was suffering from migraine.[10]

After he was informed that the plants in his backyard were marijuana, the men took pictures of him and themselves. Thereafter, he was brought inside the house where he and the military men spent the night.[11]

At around ten o'clock that same morning, they brought him with them to the city hall. Accused-appellant saw that one of the two (2) service vehicles they brought was fully loaded with plants. He was later told by the military men that said plants were marijuana.[12] Upon arrival at the city hall, the men met with the mayor and then unloaded the alleged marijuana plants. A picture of him together with the arresting team was taken with the alleged marijuana as back drop. Soon thereafter, he was taken to Hda. Socorro at the SAF Headquarters.[13]

A criminal complaint for violation of Section 9 of R.A. No. 6425, as amended by R.A. No. 7659 was filed against accused-appellant.

Turning to the legal defenses of accused-appellant, we now consider his allegation that his constitutional right against unreasonable searches and seizures had been violated by the police authorities.

The relevant constitutional provisions are found in Sections 2 and 3 [2], Article III of the 1987 Constitution which read as follows:

> Sec. 2. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures of whatever nature and for any purpose shall be inviolable, and no search warrant or warrant of arrest shall issue except upon probable cause to be determined personally by the judge after examination under oath or affirmation of the complainant and the witnesses he may produce, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.
>
> Sec. 3. xxx
>
> (2) Any evidence obtained in violation of this or the preceding section shall be inadmissible for any purpose in any proceeding.

Said constitutional provisions are safeguards against reckless, malicious and unreasonable invasion of privacy and liberty. The Court, in *Villanueva v. Querubin*, [14] underscored their importance:

> It is deference to one's personality that lies at the core of this right, but it could be also looked upon as a recognition of a constitutionally protected area, primarily one's home, but not necessarily thereto confined. What is sought to be guarded is a man's prerogative to choose who is allowed entry to his residence. In that haven of refuge, his individuality can assert itself not only in the choice of who shall be welcome but likewise in the kind of objects he wants around him. There the state, however powerful, does not as such have access except under the circumstances above noted, for in the traditional formulation, his house, however humble, is his castle. Thus is outlawed any unwarranted intrusion by government, which is called upon to refrain from any invasion of his dwelling and to respect the privacies of his life. In the same vein, Landynski in his authoritative work could fitly characterize this constitutional right as the embodiment of "a spiritual concept: the belief that to value the privacy of home and person and to afford its constitutional protection against the long reach of government is no less than to value human dignity, and that his privacy must not be disturbed except in case of overriding social need, and then only under stringent procedural safeguards."[15]

A search and seizure, therefore, must be carried out through or with a judicial warrant; otherwise, such search and seizure becomes "unreasonable" within the meaning of the constitutional provision.[16] Evidence secured thereby, i.e., the "fruits" of the search and seizure, will be inadmissible in evidence for any purpose in any proceeding."[17]

The requirement that a warrant must be obtained from the proper judicial authority prior to the conduct of a search and seizure is, however, not absolute. There are several instances when the law recognizes exceptions, such as when the owner of the premises consents or voluntarily submits to a search;[18] when the owner of the premises waives his right against such incursion;[19] when the search is incidental