

Republic of the Philippines Supreme Court Manila

SECOND DIVISION

VICENTE SUAREZ JR. y BANUA, Petitioner,

G.R. No. 268672

Members:

LEONEN, *SAJ*, *Chairperson* LAZARO-JAVIER, LOPEZ, M., LOPEZ, J., and KHO, JR., *JJ*.

- X

PEOPLE	OF THE	Promulgated:
PHILIPPINES,	Respondent.	DEC 0 4 2023 Human
		U

DECISION

LAZARO-JAVIER, J.:

-versus-

This Petition for Review on *Certiorari*¹ under Rule 45 assails the following dispositions of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. SP No. 167998 titled *People of the Philippines v. Vicente Suarez Jr. y Banua*:

a) the Decision² dated October 27, 2022, which nullified the dispositions of Branch 15 of the Regional Trial Court of Tabaco City, Albay granting petitioner Vicente Suarez Jr. *y* Banua's motion to enter a plea of guilty to a lesser offense, convicting him for such lesser offense, and denying reconsideration of its decision; and

Rollo, pp. 10-24.

Id. at 31-40. Penned by Associate Justice Gabriel T. Robeniol with Associate Justices Marlene B. Gonzales-Sison and Michael P. Ong concurring.

b) the Resolution³ dated July 11, 2023 denying petitioner's motion for the reconsideration.

Antecedents

By Information⁴ dated May 27, 2019, petitioner was charged with violation of Article II, Section 5 of Republic Act No. 9165⁵ which reads:

That, on March 20, 2019, along Ziga Avenue, Basud, Tabaco City, Province of Albay, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, not being authorized by law to sell, deliver, transport, distribute, or give away to another any dangerous drug, did then and there, willfully, unlawfully and feloniously, sell and deliver to a poseur buyer one heat-sealed transparent plastic sachet with marking EBB 3/20/19 1, containing 2.1585 grams of methamphetamine hydrochloride, a dangerous drug, against public order and policy.

ACTS CONTRARY TO LAW.6

On September 21, 2019, petitioner pleaded not guilty to the crime charged. On August 3, 2020, petitioner filed a motion to enter a plea of guilty to lesser offense of violation of Article II, Section 12 of Republic Act No. 9165, in lieu of the original charge of violation of Section 5 of the same law. Respondent People of the Philippines (respondent) opposed the motion, asserting that the evidence is sufficient to convict petitioner for illegal sale of dangerous drugs and emphasized that the approval of the public prosecutor and the arresting officers are required in plea bargaining for offenses under Republic Act No. 9165.⁷

Ruling of the Regional Trial Court

Under Order⁸ dated September 14, 2020, the trial court granted petitioner's motion. Petitioner was rearraigned, and with the assistance of counsel, pleaded guilty to violation of Article II, Section 12 of Republic Act No. 9165. The trial court then ordered that petitioner's plea of guilty be entered into the records of the case.⁹

æ

³ Id. at 42-44. Penned by Associate Justice Gabriel T. Robeniol with Associate Justices Marlene B. Gonzales-Sison and Michael P. Ong concurring.

⁴ *Id.* at 86.

⁵ Otherwise known as the "Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002."

⁶ Rollo, p. 86.

⁷ Id. at 32–33.

⁸ Id. at 75–76.

⁹ Id. at 76.

Subsequently, by Decision¹⁰ dated October 1, 2020, the trial court found petitioner guilty of violation of Article II, Section 12 of Republic Act No. 9165:¹¹

WHEREFORE, foregoing premises considered, judgment is hereby rendered finding the accused <u>VICENTE SUAREZ v BANUA, JR.</u> guilty for violation of [Article II, Section 12 of Republic Act No.] 9165 (Possession of Equipment, Apparatus, and other Paraphernalia for Dangerous Drugs) and is hereby meted an indeterminate penalty of two (2) years to four (4) years and a fine of Ten Thousand Pesos ([PHP]10,000.00).

Accordingly also, accused is hereby ordered to: 1) voluntarily submit herself (sic) in (sic) Risk Assessment Program by the concerned Rural Health Office and to undergo appropriate program (sic) such as General Intervention, Community Based Rehabilitation, and/or After Care Program of the Government; 2) support and cooperate with the Anti-Illegal Drug Campaign of the Philippine National Police (PNP), Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA), Local Government Units (LGU) and other concerned government agencies to suppress and eradicate the proliferation of Illegal Drugs in the community and will also serve as a lecturer/resource speaker during symposia on the ill-effects of illegal drugs to the user as well as in the community; and 3) not engage in any illegal activities particularly illegal drug activities and shall help and support the proper authorities in maintaining the peace and order in the community and in the Barangay where he is residing. The above-stated conditions shall be incorporated in the conditions for his probation and any violation thereof shall be a ground for the cancellation and revocation of his probation.

SO ORDERED.¹² (Emphasis in the original)

Respondent sought a reconsideration, reiterating that neither the prosecution nor the arresting officers consented to petitioner's plea of guilty to a lesser offense.¹³ It was denied by the trial court per its Order¹⁴ dated November 17, 2020.

Ruling of the Court of Appeals

Dissatisfied, respondent went to the Court of Appeals on a petition for *certiorari*, faulting the trial court with grave abuse of discretion for allowing petitioner to plead guilty to a lesser offense, sans its concurrence; and even though such lesser offense is not necessarily included in the offense charged. In praying that the case be remanded to the trial court for continuation of the proceedings on the original charge, respondent averred that petitioner's right against double jeopardy will not be violated.¹⁵

11 Id. at 78.

¹⁰ Id. at 77–78.

¹² Id.

¹³ *Id.* at 92.

¹⁴ Id. at 79–80. ¹⁵ Id. at 61-69

¹⁵ Id. at 61–69.

In his Comment,¹⁶ petitioner countered that pursuant to *Estipona v. Lobrigo*,¹⁷ the approval or denial of the plea bargaining proposal is entirely within the sound discretion of the trial court. It is the duty of the trial court to rule against the objection of the prosecution and grant the request for plea bargaining if it is just under the circumstances. Further, a prosecution under the original charge violates petitioner's right against double jeopardy since he has pleaded to a valid information before a competent court that had already convicted him after he was allowed to plead guilty to a lesser offense.¹⁸

Under its Decision¹⁹ dated October 27, 2022, the Court of Appeals granted respondent's petition for *certiorari*, nullified the assailed dispositions and remanded the case to the trial court, thus:²⁰

WHEREFORE, the *Petition* is GRANTED. The September 14, 2020 Order, October 1, 2020 Decision, and November 17, 2020 Order of the Regional Trial Court of Tabaco City, Albay, Branch 15, in Criminal Case No. T-7583 are NULLIFIED. The case is REMANDED to Regional Trial Court of Tabaco City, Albay, Branch 15 for the continuation of the trial against private respondent Vicente Suarez y Banua, Jr. on the original charge of violation of [Article II, Section 5 of Republic Act No.] 9165.

SO ORDERED.²¹ (Emphasis in the original)

The Court of Appeals agreed with respondent that the consent of the prosecutor is a condition *sine qua non* to obtaining a valid plea of guilty to a lesser offense. Thus, the trial court allegedly acted with grave abuse of discretion when it gave due course to petitioner's motion in the absence of the prosecutor's approval and despite his objections. Since petitioner's plea to a lesser offense was invalid, it is not a bar to another prosecution for the same act or omission for which the accused was initially indicted for.²²

In its Resolution²³ dated July 11, 2023, the Court of Appeals denied petitioner's motion for reconsideration.

The Present Petition

Petitioner now seeks affirmative relief and prays that the assailed dispositions of the Court of Appeals be reversed and a new one rendered,

¹⁶ Id. at 102–113.

¹⁷ 816 Phil. 789 (2017) [Per J. Peralta, En Banc].

¹⁸ Id. at 104–109.

¹⁹ Rollo, pp. 31-40. Penned by Associate Justice Gabriel T. Robeniol with Associate Justices Marlene B. Gonzales-Sison and Michael P. Ong, concurring.

²⁰ *Id.* at 40.

²¹ Id.

Id. at 39.
 Id. at 42-44. Penned by Associate Justice Gabriel T. Robeniol with Associate Justices Marlene B. Gonzales-Sison and Michael P. Ong, concurring.

affirming the trial court's Order dated September 14, 2020, Decision dated October 1, 2020, and Order dated November 17, 2020.²⁴

Petitioner asserts that while the acceptance of an offer to plead guilty to a lesser offense is not demandable by the accused as a matter of right, its resolution is ultimately determined by the trial court. Even when both the accused and the prosecution agree to plea bargaining, the request remains subject to the approval of the court. Hence, notwithstanding the prosecution's objection, the trial court may still allow an accused to plead guilty to a lesser offense. Too, petitioner reiterates his argument that a remand of the case will violate his constitutional right against double jeopardy.²⁵

Our Ruling

We reverse. The guidelines in *People v. Montierro*²⁶ are apropos, thus:

- 1. Offers for plea bargaining must be initiated in writing by way of a formal written motion filed by the accused in court.
- 2. The lesser offense which the accused proposes to plead guilty to must necessarily be included in the offense charged.
- 3. Upon receipt of the proposal for plea bargaining that is compliant with the provisions of the Plea Bargaining Framework in Drugs Cases, the judge shall order that a drug dependency assessment be administered. If the accused admits drug use, or denies it but is found positive after a drug dependency test, then he/she shall undergo treatment and rehabilitation for a period of not less than six (6) months. Said period shall be credited to his/her penalty and the period of his/her after-care and follow-up program if the penalty is still unserved. If the accused is found negative for drug use/dependency, then he/she will be released on time served, otherwise, he/she will serve his/her sentence in jail minus the counselling period at rehabilitation center.
- 4. As a rule, plea bargaining requires the mutual agreement of the parties and remains subject to the approval of the court. Regardless of the mutual agreement of the parties, the acceptance of the offer to plead guilty to a lesser offense is not demandable by the accused as a matter of right but is a matter addressed entirely to the sound discrction of the court.
 - a. Though the prosecution and the defense may agree to enter into a plea bargain, it does not follow that the courts will automatically approve the proposal. Judges must still exercise sound discretion in granting or denying plea bargaining, taking into account the relevant circumstances, including the character of the accused.

²⁴ *Id.* at 23.

 $^{^{25}}$ Id. at 20–22.

G.R. No. 254564, July 26, 2022 [Per J. Caguioa, En Banc].

- 5. The court shall not allow plea bargaining if the objection to the plea bargaining is valid and supported by evidence to the effect that:
 - a. the offender is a recidivist, habitual offender, known in the community as a drug addict and a troublemaker, has undergone rehabilitation but had a relapse, or has been charged many times; or
 - b. when the evidence of guilt is strong.
- 6. Plea bargaining in drugs cases shall not be allowed when the proposed plea bargain does not conform to the Court-issued Plea Bargaining Framework in Drugs Cases.
- 7. Judges may overrule the objection of the prosecution if it is based solely on the ground that the accused's plea bargaining proposal is inconsistent with the acceptable plea bargain under any internal rules or guidelines of the DOJ, though in accordance with the plea bargaining framework issued by the Court, if any.
- 8. If the prosecution objects to the accused's plea bargaining proposal due to the circumstances enumerated in item no. 5, the trial court is mandated to hear the prosecution's objection and rule on the merits thereof. If the trial court finds the objection meritorious, it shall order the continuation of the criminal proceedings.
- 9. If an accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Act No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking or pushing under Section 5 in relation to Section 24 thereof, then the law on probation shall apply.²⁷ (Emphasis supplied)

On April 10, 2018, the Court adopted A.M. No. 18-03-16-SC, also known as the Plea Bargaining Framework in Drugs Cases. The same outlines the acceptable plea bargain of an accused, based on the quantity of dangerous drugs involved, depending on the specific violation of Republic Act No. 9165 charged. With respect to violation of Article II, Section 5 of Republic Act No. 9165 involving methamphetamine hydrochloride or *shabu*, the Plea Bargaining Framework in Drugs Cases states:²⁸

Offense Charged			Acceptable Plea Bargain		Remarks
Section	Penalty	Quantity	Section	Penalty	
Section 5. Sale,	Life	.01 gram to .99	Section 12.	6 months	In all instances,
Trading, etc. of	Imprisonment	grams	Possession of	and 1 day	whether or not
Dangerous Drugs	to Death and	(Methamphetamine	Equipment,	to 4 years	the maximum
(Methamphetami	fine ranging	hydrochloride or	Instrument,	and a	period of the
ne hydrochloride	from	shabu only)	Apparatus	fine	penalty
or shabu only)	P500,000.00		and Other	ranging	imposed is
	to		Paraphernali	from	already served,
	P10,000,000.0		a for	P10,000	drug
	0		Dangerous	to	dependency
			Drugs	P50,000	test shall be
					required. If
					accused admits

²⁷ Id.

²⁸ SC Administrative Matter No. 18-03-16-SC, April 10, 2018, Adoption of the Plea Bargaining Framework in Drugs Cases. (Emphasis supplied)

Γ

 court is denies that is given the discretion of found positive discretion of the dependency in the discretion of the shall undergy treatment and and and an erhabilitation on the shall undergy treatment and and and an erhabilitation on the shall undergy treatment and and and an erhabilitation on the shall undergy treatment and and an erhabilitation on the shall undergy treatment and and an erhabilitation of the aperiod shall be transpected. It appendix the shall undergy provided is accused in a secure of the apendity within unserved. It accused is accused in secure his shere period and the range of the apendity within unserved. It accused is accused in accused is accused in accused applies for prohation in offenses prohation is offenses prohation is offenses prohation is offenses prohation is offenses application to a probation shall apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride) allowed allowed application shall apply. 			·		
 given the fourt positive after the discretion n to dependency text, heigh similar undergramment and an amaximum m period at amaximum m period at amaximum m period the text heigh similar undergramment and an amaximum m period shall be redicated to be the text and the period shall be redicated to the text and the period shall be text and the period shall be text and the period shall be redicated to the text and the period shall be redicated to the text and the period shall be text and the period shall be redicated to the text and the period shall be text and the period shall be redicated to the text and the period shall be text and t					
 discretion after dependency impose a minimum inimum merido and a merido discretion and a discretion a discretion a discretion a discretion a discretion and a discretion and a discretion and a discretion discretion a discretion a discretion a discretion a d					
 n to dependency. impose a minimu m period and a maximu m period to be be trabilitation for a period to be penalty for an of the penalty straight penalty within the range of the range accused in penalty is still unserved. I accused the penalty is still unserved. I found negative months and I day us/dependent to I year (here will serve with a penalty is still under the range of the penalty is still unserved. I found negative months and I day us/dependent the law of the range of the serve will be the serve with sentence in jain minus the here accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under the law of the range of the penalty is still under the law of the range of the serve will be the law of the serve will be the ser					
 impose a trest, he/sh shall undergy treatment and m period and a maximu m period and a maximu m period that in a period shall be taken the range of his her penalty is still unserved. I and the period point is a straight period of his after care and by law. A straight period of his after care and the period at the care and the period of his after and the period at the period of his after and the period at the period athe period at the period athe period at the period at the per					
 infinition in period in the treatment and maximulation of the period in the state of the period shall be period shall period shall be period shall be period shall be period shal					
 merical and a maximu for a period on the state of the period points. Said on the period penalty is still unserved. If the period penalty is still unserved in the section of the state of the state of the section of the state of the penalty is still unserved. If the section of the state of the section of the section of the state of the section of the state of the section of the state of the section of the section of the state of the section of the state of the section of the state of the section of the section of the state of the section of the state of the section of the section of the state of the section of the state of the section of					
 and a maximu m period on the less than of the period shall be redited to not less than of the period shall be redited to the mange of t					
I.00gram and above (Methampletami ne (Methampletami ne the shove differed themaximu more aperide on to be the the the the the show the sh					
 in period in period		e			
to be months Saith period shalls credited to trange of his after ange of his after and by law. A follow-up straight penalty within the range of 6 found negative months and 1 year may bis still unserved. If the range of 6 found negative months and 1 year may bis still unserved. If the range of his after penalty within the range of 6 found negative months and 1 year may bis still unserved. If the range of his after penalty is still unserved. If the range of his after penalty within the range of a found negative months and they have the sector of the range of a found negative months and they have the sector of the range of a found negative months and they have the sector of the sect					not less than 6
taken from the range of his/her penalty provided the and the period his/her penalty of his/her penalty provided the the range of of his/her penalty ind the period of his after care and the period of his after penalty within unserved. I acoused in the range of of monts and I day usser/dependence to the served the serve his serve his<				-	
from the credited to the period of the perio					
 i.00 gram and above 				from the	
he and the period of his after provided by law. A straight penalty within the range of 6 found negative within and 1 day use/dependenc to 1 year y, he'she wil be released of found negative time served be otherwise, imposed. impo				range of	his/her penalty
 j.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride 				the	and the period
 by law. A straight program i follow-up program i follow-up is still unserved. I penalty within unserved. I the range of 6 found negative for drug use/dependent of 1 year y, he/she will be released or otherwise, imposed. i.00 gram and above 				penalty	of his after-
 straight penalty is stil within the range of of four drug use/dependenc mouths and I day use/dependenc to y, he/she will be therwise, imposed. he/she will served his served his served his served his serve his serve his serve his serve his serve and the served applies for period a coused applies for probation at reflabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami and Monor period) a apply. 				provided	care and
 Penalty penalty is still unserved. If doubt negative for drug served is subscription in the range of 6 months use/dependence y, he/she will be released or therwise, he/she will be released or the/she will be released or therwise, he/she will be released or					
 within unserved. I the range of 6 for drug use/dependency to a relaxed or imposed. be released o				-	
 the range of 6 found negative months and I day use/dependence of 9 found negative months and I day use/dependence of 9 found negative may likewise be time served otherwise, imposed. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *					penalty is still
 of 6 found negative for drug use/dependence y, he/she will use/dependence y, he/she will be released or otherwise, imposed. * *					
 months and i day us/dependence with the released of time served otherwise, timposed. imposed. <li< td=""><td> </td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></li<>					
and I day to I year may may may likewise be imposed. he/she will serve his sentence in jai minus the counseling period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation ir offenses punder [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 ir relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law of probation shal apply.					
to 1 year may likewise be released or otherwise, he/she will serve his serve his serve his serve his serve his serve his server, i accused applies for protation i offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than fo illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law or probation shal apply.					
 may be released or time served otherwise, he/she will serve him sentence in jai minus the counseling period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Act No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking or pushing under Section 5 in relation to Section 5 in relation 5 in the Section 5 in relation 5 in the Section 5 in the Section 5 in relati				•	
imposed. likewise be imposed. time served otherwise, be/she will sentence in jail minus the counseling period a rehabilitation center. imposed. However, in accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking oo pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Section 5 10 probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride No plea bargaining allowed					
 be otherwise, he/she will serve his sentence in jai minus the counseling period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than foi illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sect					1 1
 imposed. he/she will serve his sentence in jai minus the counseling period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation i offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than foi illegal drug trafficking o pusbing unde Section 5 in relation to Section 5					
 Serve his sentence in jai minus the counseling period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation ir offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Section 5 in relation 5 in r					
sentence in jai minus thi counseling period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking o pussing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					
 minus the counseling period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride 		¢.			
 period a rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law or probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride allowed ne hydrochloride allowed ne hydrochloride allowed ne hydrochloride allowed allow					
* rehabilitation center. However, i accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than fo illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					counseling
* Center. However, in accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking or pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride (Methamphetami No plea allowed					
* However, in accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply.					rehabilitation
* accused applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than for illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law or probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					
* applies for probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than fo illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law or probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					
 probation in offenses punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than fo illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride 					
image: state of the state					
* Punishable under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than fo illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					
* under [Republic Ac No.] 9165, other than fo illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *					
* No.] 9165, other than fo illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and No plea bargaining allowed ne hydrochloride	-				
* other than for illegal drug trafficking o pushing unde Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and above (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					
* trafficking of pushing under Section 5 in relation to Section 5 in re					other than for
* trafficking of pushing under Section 5 in relation to Section 5 in re					
* Section 5 in relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law on probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and No plea bargaining (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					trafficking or
* relation to Sec 24 thereof then the law or probation shall apply. 1.00 gram and No plea bargaining (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					pushing under
* 24 thereof then the law or probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and No plea above bargaining (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					Section 5 in
* then the law or probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and No plea above bargaining (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					1
* probation shal apply. 1.00 gram and No plea above bargaining (Methamphetami ne hydrochloride					
1.00 gram and No plea apply. above bargaining (Methamphetami allowed ne hydrochloride		ů.			[]]
1.00 gram and aboveNo bargaining allowed(Methamphetami ne hydrochlorideallowed					
above bargaining (Methamphetami allowed ne hydrochloride					appiy.
above bargaining (Methamphetami allowed ne hydrochloride		1.00 gram and	No nlea		
(Methamphetami allowed ne hydrochloride		~	•		
ne hydrochloride					
or shahu only)		ne hydrochloride	1		
	<u> </u>	or shabu only)			<u> </u>

As affirmed in *Montierro*, plea bargaining must conform to the Plea Bargaining Framework in Drugs Cases. Also, the concurrence of the prosecution is not an indispensable requirement for the trial court's grant of the motion to plead guilty to a lesser offense. Rather, the trial court must exercise its sound discretion in accepting the terms of the plea bargaining.

The Court, nonetheless, finds that the trial court should not have granted the offer to plead guilty to a lesser offense in this case for the simple reason that the original charge for which he was indicted (violation of Article II, Section 5 of Republic Act No. 9165) involved **2.1585 grams** of methamphetamine hydrochloride, in which case, plea bargaining is proscribed. Evidently, therefore, the trial court gravely erred in granting petitioner's motion for plea bargaining and in consequently convicting him of the lesser offense of violation of Article II, Section 12 of Republic Act No. 9165.

The Court notes, however, that although plea bargaining should not have been allowed based on the aforesaid guidelines, this argument was never put to fore by respondent itself in any of its pleadings before the trial court, the appellate court, and now even before the Court. Respondent's opposition was solely anchored on the fact that it did not conform to petitioner's proposed plea bargaining.²⁹ In any event, both the trial court and the appellate court themselves overlooked the fact that petitioner's case fell within the excepting clause.

As it was, the trial court approved petitioner's proposed plea bargaining which eventually led to his re-arraignment, his plea of guilty to the lesser offense of violation of Article II, Section 12 of Republic Act No. 9165, and finally, the promulgation of a judgment of conviction against him for such lesser offense, which judgment has already become final and executory.

The question now hinges on the validity of the appellate court's order to remand the case for continuation of the proceedings petitioner's arraignment and trial, and the trial court's rendition of judgment on the original charge of violation of Article II, Section 5 of Republic Act No. 9165.

On this score, however, the Court sustains petitioner's invocation of double jeopardy. Indeed, all the requisites therefor are present in this case: (1) petitioner was indicted under a valid Information, (2) the trial court possessed jurisdiction over him and the offense charged; (3) following the trial court's approval of his plea bargain, he was arraigned for the lesser offense and entered a valid plea therefor; and (4) there was a termination of the case in view of petitioner's eventual conviction for violation of Article II, Section 12 of Republic Act No. 9165.³⁰

²⁹ *Rollo*, p. 68.

³⁰ People v. Nitafan, 362 Phil. 58, 74 (1999) [Per J. Martinez, En Banc].

Decision

In *Villa Gomez v. People*,³¹ the Court held that since rules of procedure are not ends in themselves, courts may still brush aside procedural infirmities in favor of resolving the merits of the case. Correlatively, since legal representation before the courts and quasi-judicial bodies is a matter of procedure, any procedural lapse pertaining to such matter may be deemed waived when no timely objections have been raised.³² In the same vein, plea bargaining being a rule of procedure,³³ respondent's failure to invoke petitioner's disqualification from plea bargaining may be deemed waived. That the trial court and the Court of Appeals erred in their application of the Plea Bargaining Framework in Drugs Cases in favor of petitioner; and respondent was even deemed to have waived the exclusion clause therein should not be blamed on petitioner. His right against double jeopardy should therefore be sustained.

ACCORDINGLY, the Petition for Review on *Certiorari* is **PARTLY GRANTED**. The Decision dated October 27, 2022 and Resolution dated July 11, 2023 of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. SP No. 167998 are **REVERSED**. Criminal Case No. T-7583 is declared **CLOSED** and **TERMINATED**.

Let entry of final judgment be issued immediately.

SO ORDERED.

ZARO-JAVIER Associate Justice

³¹ 889 Phil. 915, 962 (2020) [Per J. Gesmundo, En Banc].

³² Id.

³³ Estipona v. Lobrigo, 816 Phil. 789, 796 (2017) [Per J. Peralta, En Banc].

WE CONCUR:

MARVIC M.V.F. LEONE

Senior Associate Justice Chairperson, Second Division

JHOSE OPEZ Associate Justice

ANTONIO T. KHO, JR. Associate Justice

ATTESTATION

I attest that the conclusions in the above Decision had been reached in consultation before the case was assigned to the writer of the opinion of the Court's Division.

MARVIC M.V.F. LEONEN Chairperson, Second Division

CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Article VIII, Section 13 of the Constitution and the Division Chairperson's Attestation, I certify that the conclusions in the above Decision had been reached in consultation before the case was assigned to the writer of the opinion of the Court's Division.

ÍUNDO Chief Justice