

SEVENTH DIVISION

[CA-G.R. SP No. 128670, November 24, 2014]

**ENGR. RUBEN U. YU, PETITIONER, VS. THERESA ROSE H. SIA,
RESPONDENT.**

D E C I S I O N

INTING, S.B., J.:

This *Petition*^[1] seeks to reverse and set aside the *Resolution*^[2] dated 19 November 2012 of the Department of Justice through the Regional Prosecution Office, Regional Office No. V, Rawis, Legazpi City, Albay, as well as its Order^[3] dated 12 January 2013 in NPS Docket No. V-02-INV-11E-00121 entitled, "*Engr. Ruben Y. Yu, Complainant-appellant, -versus- Theresa Rose H. Sia, Respondent-appellee,*" which dismissed herein petitioner's petition for review and denied his motion for reconsideration, respectively.

THE FACTS

Ruben U. Yu (herein petitioner) filed a criminal complaint for Falsification of Document penalized under paragraph 1, of Article 172, in relation to paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 171 of the Revised Penal Code against Theresa Rose H. Sia (herein respondent). The latter allegedly falsified two (2) separate certifications she attached to: 1) the civil complaint for specific performance with damages; and 2) criminal complaint for violation of Presidential Decree 1096 and Estafa and other deceits, which she filed against petitioner before the Regional trial Court, Legazpi City and the Office of the City prosecutor of Legazpi, respectively, on behalf of the Heirs of Manuel T. Sia, Inc.

On 4 June 2012 the Prosecutor II of the Office of the Provincial Prosecutor of Albay, Rawis, Legazpi City, rendered a resolution.^[4] The dispositive portion of which reads:

"WHEREFORE, for lack of competent evidence to show that respondent is liable for the crime of falsification defined under paragraph 1, Article 172 of the Revised Penal Code, the above-entitled case is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice.

SO RESOLVED."^[5]

Petitioner filed his motion for reconsideration of the above-quoted resolution. However, it was denied in a Resolution^[6] dated 12 September 2012, by the Provincial Prosecutor of Sorsogon in this wise:

"WHEREFORE, the motion for reconsideration is **DENIED** for lack of merit. Let the entire records of this case be returned to the Office of the Regional Prosecutor.

SO RESOLVED."^[7]

Petitioner then filed his petition for review before the Regional State Prosecutor, Regional Office No. V, Rawis, Legazpi City, which issued a Resolution^[8] dated 19 November 2012, denying said petition, as follows:

"WHEREFORE, In view of the foregoing premises, there being no new issue/s raised to warrant the reversal or modification of the resolution sought to be reconsidered, the petition for review is hereby **denied** for lack of merit."^[9]

Petitioner filed his motion for reconsideration before the above-mentioned Regional Prosecution Office but it was denied. Hence, this appeal by petition for review.

THE APPEAL

Petitioner filed the present appeal by petition for review^[10] with the following assignment of errors:

"A. The Honorable Department of Justice, with all due respect and deference, committed grave reversible error in the application of law in dismissing the Petition for review interposed by the Petitioner thereby injuriously affecting substantial rights of the Petitioner.

B. Furthermore, the Honorable Investigating Prosecutor committed reversible error in dismissing the complaint of the Petitioner for alleged absence of competent evidence to sustain the finding of probable cause against the respondent."^[11]

Petitioner asserts that that it was erroneous for the Department of Justice (DOJ) to dismiss his complaint on the basis of private respondent's acknowledgement on an affidavit that the signatures appearing on the two (2) certificates, subject of petitioner's complaint, are hers. According to petitioner, simple affidavit would not suffice to establish genuineness and authenticity of a particular document. Without authentication, it was mere hearsay and had no evidentiary weight.

Petitioner also argues that the Investigating Prosecutor was mistaken when it found no probable cause to hold private respondent for trial for the crime of falsification as it overstepped the boundary of proof required for the determination of probable cause. He contended that it is enough that it is believed that the act or omission complained of constitute the offense charged. Thus, he prayed that his petition be granted.