

THIRTEENTH DIVISION

[CA-G.R. SP NO. 91960, August 14, 2006]

NELSON K. DY, NORMAN K. DY, LINDSAY KAREN DY, NAPOLEON K. DY, NORA K. DY, NANCY K. DY LILIBETH K. DY, NKD INTERNATIONAL TRADING CORPORATION AND NPW INTERNATIONAL TRADING CORPORATION, PETITIONERS, VS. HON. ANTONIO M. EUGENIO, IN HIS CAPACITY AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE REGIONAL TRIAL COURT OF MANILA, BRANCH 24, PNP POL. INSP. RAMON B. GOLONG, AND BSB JUNROSE AUTO PARTS CORP., RESPONDENTS.

DECISION

SABIO, JR., J.:

No presumption of regularity maybe invoked by an officer to justify an encroachment of rights secured by the constitution. A strict interpretation of the constitutional, statutory and procedural rules authorizing search and seizure is required and strict compliance therewith is demanded (People vs. Go, 411 SCRA 81) (*underscoring for emphasis*).

Challenged for having been issued with grave abuse of discretion are: (1) the eight (8) search warrants issued by public respondent Judge of RTC, Branch 24, Manila on March 17, 2005; (2) the May 27, 2005 order of said public respondent denying petitioner's very Urgent Motion to Quash Warrants and/or Suppress Evidence obtained thereof and; (3) the September 7, 2005 order denying petitioner's motion for reconsideration thereon.

The material antecedents as culled from the records:

On March 17, 2005, private respondent PNP Pol. Insp. Ramon B. Golong, filed four (4) separate applications for issuance of search warrants. On the same date, public respondent Judge issued eight (8) search warrants:

On March 21, 2005 Respondent Golong, accompanied and assisted by his subordinate policemen, representatives of Respondent Corporation and several other persons, simultaneously swarmed on and ransacked Petitioner's business establishments and bodegas situated in various locations. They carted away truck loads of various items and merchandise solely belonging to and owned by Petitioner Nelson K. Dy.

On March 28, 2005, before transcription of the stenographic notes of the proceedings on the application for issuance of the search warrants, Petitioners filed their Very Urgent Motion to Quash Search Warrants and/or Suppress Evidences Obtained Thereof (Annex "C"). The seized properties were paid to Petitioner Nelson Dy by his bankrupt creditors, and were seized from the premises under his sole

control and supervision. The rests of the Petitioners have nothing to do with such items. They have not bought, sold or vended any of the items or automotive spare parts described in the Search Warrants.

After transcription of the stenographic notes several days later, Petitioners discovered that Respondent Golong's application for, and Respondent Judge's issuance of the subject search warrants suffer from inherent defects or infirmities which are reversible errors.

Finding necessity to amplify the grounds for their aforesaid urgent motion, after receipt of complainant's opposition thereto, Petitioners filed a Reply to Opposition to Quash, dated April 22, 2005 (Annex "F"). Specifically, they pinpointed out to the Honorable Court the serious defects and irregularity in the application for as well as in the issuance and implementation of the search warrants.

(Rollo, pp. 8-9)

With the denial of their Motions to Suppress and Motion to Quash as well as their Motion for Reconsideration, petitioners now come to Us via this instant petition anchored on the following, to wit:

"GROUNDS RELIED UPON FOR THE RELIEF

I.

RESPONDENT JUDGE COMMITTED GRAVE ABUSE OF DISCRETION AMOUNTING TO LACK OF JURISDICTION IN ISSUING THE QUESTIONED SEARCH WARRANTS, WHICH WERE IRREGULARLY APPLIED FOR AND ILLEGALLY ENFORCED BY RESPONDENT GOLONG AND HIS MEN.

II.

RESPONDENT JUDGE COMMITTED GRAVE ABUSE OF DISCRETION AMOUNTING TO LACK OF JURISDICTION IN ISSUING THE ORDER DATED MAY 27, 2005, DENYING PETITIONERS' VERY URGENT MOTION TO QUASH THE SEARCH WARRANTS AND/OR SUPPRESS EVIDENCES OBTAINED THEREOF.

III.

RESPONDENT JUDGE AUBSED HIS DISCRETION OR ACTED WITHOUT OR IN EXCESS OF HIS JURISDICTION IN HOLDING, WITHOUT CONDUCTING PRIOR HEARING, THAT PETITIONERS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION IS BEREFT OF MERIT."

(Rollo, pp. 11-12)

Petition has merit.

The constitutional requirements of a valid search warrant are:

- (1) It must be based on probable cause;
- (2) The probable cause must be determined personally by the judge;
- (3) The determination must be made after examination under oath or affirmation of the complainant and the witnesses he may produce;
- (4) It must particularly describe the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

According to Rule 126, Sec. 4 of the Rules of Court, the judge before issuing the search warrant, must "personally examine in the form of searching questions and answers, in writing and under oath the complainant and any witnesses he may produce on facts personally know to them x x x. (underscoring for emphasis). Based on said Rule, therefore, the evidence that should be offered by the complainant and his witnesses should be based on their own personal knowledge and not on mere information or belief. Hearsay is not allowed.

In the case at bench, it is very clear that the application was not based on personal knowledge but on hearsay. Consider how the application for the warrant was worded:

"COMES NOW, undersigned applicant, POLICE INSPECTOR RAMON B. GOLONG, a member of the Anti-Organized Crime and Businessmen's Concern Division, Criminal Investigation and Detective Group (CIDG), Philippine National Police (PNP), Camp Crame, Quezon City, after having been duly sworn to in accordance with law do hereby depose and say:

1. That he has been informed and verily believes that the respondents have in their possession, control and custody certain goods that are used in commerce and consists of." (underscoring for emphasis).

(Rollo, p. 1)

Thus, in the case of Alvarez vs. CFI, 64 Phil. 33, the Supreme Court annulled a search warrant issued on the strength of an affidavit based on "reliable information" which according to the affiant was "correct to the best of his knowledge and belief. It was noted that "he did not swear to the truth of his statements upon his own knowledge of the facts but upon the information received by him from a reliable person (Constitutional Law, Justice Isagani Cruz, 2003 Edition, p. 150). In the case before us, the search warrant failed to comply with the 3rd constitutional requirement for the issuance of a valid search warrant which is that it was based on alleged facts not personally known to the applicant.

Additionally, before issuing the warrant, the judge did not propound searching questions on the alleged witnesses presented. Although there is no hard and fast rule as to how a judge may conduct his examination, it is axiomatic that **said examination must be probing and exhaustive and not merely routine, general, peripheral or perfunctory** (Roan vs. Gonzales, 145 SCRA 687, cited in Pp vs. de los Reyes, 441 SCRA 305). (underscoring for emphasis). He must make his own inquiry on the intent and factual and legal justification for a warrant. The