



Republic of the Philippines
Supreme Court
Manila

SUPREME COURT OF THE PHILIPPINES
PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE

RECEIVED
NOV 05 2020

BY: *JA*
TIME: *1:45 pm*

THIRD DIVISION

NOTICE

Sirs/Mesdames:

Please take notice that the Court, Third Division, issued a Resolution dated July 15, 2020, which reads as follows:

“G.R. No. 242476 (PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, *plaintiff-appellee* v. JOJIE BAYLON y CASTRO, JAY-AR BAYLON y CASTRO, and ALVIN BAYLON y CASTRO, *accused*; JOJIE BAYLON y CASTRO and JAY-AR BAYLON y CASTRO, *accused-appellants*). — This Court resolves the appeal challenging the Decision¹ of the Court of Appeals, which affirmed the Regional Trial Court’s Joint Decision² convicting Jojie Baylon (Jojie) of illegal sale of dangerous drugs and Jay-Ar Baylon (Jay-Ar) of both illegal sale and possession of dangerous drugs.

The Information charging Jojie and Jay-Ar of illegal sale reads:

Criminal Case No. 2012-0014-D

That on or about the 10th day of January 2012, in the City of Dagupan, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, JOJIE BAYLON Y CASTRO AND JAY-AR BAYLON Y CASTRO, confederating together, acting jointly and helping each other, did then and there, willfully, unlawfully and criminally, sell and deliver to a customer Methamphetamine Hydrochloride (Shabu) contained in one (1) heat sealed plastic sachet, weighing more or less 0.20 gram, in exchange for P500.00, without authority to do so.

Contrary to Article II, Section 5, R.A. 9165.³

As for the illegal possession charge on Jay-Ar, the Information reads:

Criminal Case No. 2012-0015-D

¹ *Rollo*, pp. 2–18. The Decision was penned by Associate Justice Rosmari D. Carandang (now a member of this Court), and concurred in by Associate Justices Jane Aurora C. Lantion and Zenaida T. Galapate-Laguilles of the Third Division, Court of Appeals, Manila.

² *CA rollo*, pp. 65–78. The Decision was penned by Judge Genoveva Coching-Maramba of Branch 44, Regional Trial Court, Dagupan City.

³ *Rollo*, p. 3.

That on or about the 10th day of January 2012, in the City of Dagupan, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, JAY-AR BAYLON Y CASTRO, did then and there, willfully, unlawfully and criminally, have in his possession, custody and control Methamphetamine Hydrochloride (Shabu) contained in two (2) heat sealed plastic sachets, weighing more or less 0.219 gram, without authority to possess the same.

Contrary to Article II, Section 11, R.A. 9165.⁴

Jojie and Jay-Ar's brother, Alvin, was also charged with illegal possession. All three were arraigned, and all three pleaded not guilty to the charges. After a consolidation of the cases, pre-trial and trial ensued.⁵

The prosecution presented as its witnesses Police Senior Inspector Myrna Malojo-Todeño (Inspector Malojo-Todeño),⁶ Police Officer 3 Shayne G. Daciego (PO3 Daciego), PO2 Randy Nepascua (PO2 Nepascua), PO2 Manuel Piapa Cruz (PO2 Cruz), and Senior Police Officer 1 Arnold Bautista (SPO1 Bautista). It also presented SPO1 Salvador Cancho, though the parties dispensed with his testimony.⁷

According to the prosecution, at around 4:00 p.m. on January 10, 2012, officers of the Dagupan Police Station were briefed for a buy-bust operation against Jojie, based on a tip from a confidential informant. PO2 Nepascua was designated as poseur-buyer, with PO2 Cruz and SPO1 Bautista as his back-up. He prepared the pertinent documents and marked a ₱500.00 bill as buy-bust money.⁸

An hour later, the team proceeded with the informant to Fernandez Street in Dagupan. From there, PO2 Nepascua and the informant walked into an alley, and there they saw Jojie. The informant first spoke with her, but eventually, she asked for the money. After PO2 Nepascua had handed the marked money, Jojie left and retreated into a *barong-barong*. When she returned shortly, a man was already with her. It was this man, later identified as Jojie's brother Jay-Ar, who handed PO2 Nepascua a heat-sealed plastic sachet of suspected shabu. At once, PO2 Nepascua raised his left hand to signal that the sale was done. This prompted SPO1 Bautista and PO2 Cruz to rush in and, with PO2 Nepascua, arrested both of them.⁹

Alvin, Jojie and Jay-Ar's brother, intruded and tried to rescue the two, for which the officers also arrested him. Upon frisking him, PO2 Cruz

⁴ Id. at 3.

⁵ CA *rollo*, pp. 66-67.

⁶ At times, Todeño was referred to as Tofiedo in the *rollo*.

⁷ *Rollo*, pp. 4-5.

⁸ Id. at 6.

⁹ Id. at 6-7.

seized another plastic sachet of shabu. When SPO1 Bautista also frisked Jay-Ar, he recovered two more sachets.¹⁰

The police officers then took the siblings and the seized items to the police station for booking and documentation. There, they took photographs of the trio, the seized items, and the marked money. They also prepared a letter-request for laboratory examination and the affidavit of arrest, along with three confiscation receipts signed by a certain Rebecca C. Cabading of the Dagupan City Prosecution Office. Then, all three officers went to the Crime Laboratory. Inspector Malojo-Todeño, who examined the specimens, later reported that they tested positive for shabu.¹¹

Jojie, Jay-Ar, and Alvin all testified for the defense.¹²

Jojie recalled that, on the day of the incident, she was sleeping with her son when police officers barged into their house, dragged her out, and shoved her into a vehicle. When they reached the police station, she was stripped of her clothes, but she said that the officers found nothing.¹³

Jay-Ar, for his part, recalled that around this time, he was outside their house chatting with his neighbors. Before returning home, one of the neighbors informed him that police officers were at their place. When he saw the officers, Jay-Ar performed a salute at all six of them. Yet, just then, the officers went on to restrain him, telling him to bring them to his house.¹⁴

As they reached the house, one of the officers hit Jay-Ar with a gun. Despite his pleas, the officers broke in and invited him and his sister Jojie to go with them. When he refused, they dragged him out of the house. His brother Alvin ran to them and asked why they were arresting his siblings. Instead of answering, one of the officers hit Alvin with a gun and dragged him to the vehicle. They were all brought to the police station.¹⁵

Alvin declared that he did not witness his siblings' arrests. He recalled that he was near his house arranging bottles when PO2 Cruz ordered him to board the vehicle. He agreed, thinking that he did not do anything wrong. However, the police officer still dragged him inside the vehicle and kicked him.¹⁶

¹⁰ Id. at 7.

¹¹ Id. at 7-8.

¹² Id. at 9.

¹³ Id.

¹⁴ Id.

¹⁵ Id. at 9-10.

¹⁶ Id. at 10.

In its June 22, 2016 Joint Decision,¹⁷ the Regional Trial Court convicted Jojie, Jay-Ar, and Alvin of the crimes charged.¹⁸ It ruled that the prosecution established all the elements of the crimes through its witnesses.¹⁹ Moreover, it held that there was substantial compliance with the requirements under Republic Act No. 9165 and that there was an unbroken chain of custody over the sachets of shabu.²⁰ The dispositive portion of the Joint Decision reads:

WHEREFORE, judgment is hereby rendered in:

1. CRIM. CASE NO. 2012-0014-D finding accused **JOJIE BAYLON y Castro** and **JAY-AR BAYLON y Castro** **GUILTY** beyond reasonable doubt with Violation of Art. II, Sec. 5 of RA 9165 otherwise known as the Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002 and are hereby both sentenced to suffer life imprisonment and each to pay a fine in the amount of Five hundred thousand (P500,000.00) pesos;
2. CRIM. CASE NO. 2012-0015-D finding accused **JAY-AR BAYLON y Castro** **GUILTY** beyond reasonable doubt with Violation of Sec. 11, Art. II of RA 9165 and is hereby sentenced to suffer imprisonment of Twelve (12) years and One (1) day to Twenty (20) years to pay a fine in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand (P300,000.00) Pesos; and,
3. CRIM. CASE NO. 2012-0016-D finding accused **ALVIN BAYLON y Castro** **GUILTY** beyond reasonable doubt with Violation of Sec. 11, Art. II of RA 9165 and is hereby sentenced to suffer imprisonment of Twelve (12) years and One (1) day to Twenty (20) years and to pay a fine in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand (P300,000.00) Pesos.

The subject plastic sachets of shabu are hereby ordered disposed of in accordance with law.

With costs against the said accused.

SO ORDERED.²¹ (Emphasis in the original)

They all appealed to the Court of Appeals.²²

In its December 20, 2017 Decision,²³ the Court of Appeals affirmed Jojie's and Jay-Ar's convictions but acquitted Alvin. It found that the prosecution's evidence sufficiently established that the sale took place.²⁴ It

¹⁷ CA rollo, pp. 65-78.

¹⁸ Id. at 78.

¹⁹ Id. at 73.

²⁰ Id. at 76.

²¹ Id. at 78.

²² Rollo, p. 10.

²³ Id. at 2-18.

²⁴ Id. at 12.

held that Jay-Ar's bodily search was lawful because it was incident to a lawful arrest, he being a co-conspirator. However, it acquitted Alvin because the search incidental to the warrantless arrest was "unreasonable and unlawful."²⁵

The dispositive portion of the Court of Appeals Decision read:

WHEREFORE, the appeal is **PARTLY GRANTED**. Accused-appellant Alvin C. Baylon is hereby **ACQUITTED** of the crime of violation of Section 11, Article II of Republic Act No. 9165 subject of Criminal Case No. 2012-0016-D. We **AFFIRM** the conviction of accused-appellants Jojie C. Baylon and Jay-Ar C. Baylon in Criminal Case No. 2012-0014-D and the conviction of Jay-Ar C. Baylon in Criminal Case No. 2012-0015-D and the corresponding penalties imposed by the trial court.

SO ORDERED.²⁶ (Emphasis in the original)

Jojie and Jay-Ar filed a Notice of Appeal.²⁷ In its November 28, 2018 Resolution,²⁸ this Court noted the case records forwarded by the Court of Appeals and required the parties to file their supplemental briefs. The Office of the Solicitor General,²⁹ on behalf of plaintiff-appellee People of the Philippines, and accused-appellants³⁰ manifested that they would no longer do so. Instead, they are adopting the briefs they filed before the Court of Appeals, as noted in this Court's April 1, 2019 Resolution.³¹

Accused-appellants mainly argue that the prosecution's version of the facts is fatally wanting in material details to show that the crimes charged were committed.³² They further assert that the prosecution failed to show stringent compliance with the procedural safeguards under Section 21 of Republic Act No. 9165.³³

Accused-appellants point out that no initial contact between PO2 Nepascua, the poseur-buyer, and Jojie, the alleged seller, was established. Without this, they claim, the buy-bust operation had no sufficient basis, making the alleged sale of shabu all the more dubious.³⁴

²⁵ Id. at 17.

²⁶ Id.

²⁷ Id. at 19-21.

²⁸ Id. at 24.

²⁹ Id. at 26-27.

³⁰ Id. at 30-31.

³¹ Id. at 37-38.

³² CA rollo, p. 45.

³³ Id. at 45 citing *People v. Ancheta*, 687 Phil. 569 (2012) [Per J. Sereno, Second Division].

³⁴ Id. at 47.

Moreover, accused-appellants list certain irregularities in the seized items' chain of custody. They first point out that the alleged marking was not immediately done upon arrest.³⁵ They also note that the seized items were not photographed and inventoried in the presence of a media representative and an elected public official, as required by Section 21.³⁶ These lapses, they stress, cannot be excused by the saving clause under Section 21(a) of the law's Implementing Rules and Regulations, because the prosecution failed to acknowledge these lapses to begin with.³⁷

On the other hand, the Office of the Solicitor General maintains that the buy-bust operation was valid,³⁸ and that the officers complied with the chain of custody requirements.³⁹

For this Court's resolution is the lone issue of whether or not accused-appellants Jojie Baylon y Castro and Jay-Ar Baylon y Castro were guilty beyond reasonable doubt.

This Court grants the appeal and acquits accused-appellants.

Conviction of a criminal offense requires proof beyond reasonable doubt. All the elements of the offense must be established with the same quantum of evidence.⁴⁰

The elements for the commission of illegal sale of dangerous drugs under Section 5, and illegal possession of dangerous drugs under Section 11 of Republic Act No. 9165 are settled:

In actions involving the illegal sale of dangerous drugs, the following elements must first be established: (1) proof that the transaction or sale took place and (2) the presentation in court of the *corpus delicti* or the illicit drug as evidence.

On the other hand, in prosecutions for illegal possession of a dangerous drug, it must be shown that (1) the accused was in possession of an item or an object identified to be a prohibited or regulated drug, (2) such possession is not authorized by law, and (3) the accused was freely and consciously aware of being in possession of the drug. Similarly, in this case, the evidence of the *corpus delicti* must be established beyond reasonable doubt.⁴¹

³⁵ Id. at 55.

³⁶ Id. at 56.

³⁷ Id. at 57-59.

³⁸ Id. at 105-106.

³⁹ Id. at 107-110.

⁴⁰ *People v. Que*, 824 Phil. 882, 891 (2018) [Per J. Leonen, Third Division].

⁴¹ Id. at 893 citing *People v. Morales*, 630 Phil. 215, 228 (2010) [Per J. Del Castillo, Second Division]; *People v. Darisan*, 597 Phil. 479, 485 (2009) [Per J. Corona, First Division]; and *People v. Partoza*, 605 Phil. 883, 890 (2009) [Per J. Tinga, Second Division].

Common to these two offenses is the need to establish the *corpus delicti*, which in drugs cases is the illegal substance confiscated from the accused.⁴² In light of this, the law demands strict compliance with the chain of custody requirements under Section 21 of Republic Act No. 9165.⁴³ It states in part:

SECTION 21. *Custody and Disposition of Confiscated, Seized, and/or Surrendered Dangerous Drugs, Plant Sources of Dangerous Drugs, Controlled Precursors and Essential Chemicals, Instruments/Paraphernalia and/or Laboratory Equipment.* — The PDEA shall take charge and have custody of all dangerous drugs, plant sources of dangerous drugs, controlled precursors and essential chemicals, as well as instruments/paraphernalia and/or laboratory equipment so confiscated, seized and/or surrendered, for proper disposition in the following manner:

- (1) The apprehending team having initial custody and control of the drugs shall, immediately after seizure and confiscation, physically inventory and photograph the same in the presence of the accused or the person/s from whom such items were confiscated and/or seized, or his/her representative or counsel, a representative from the media and the Department of Justice (DOJ), and any elected public official who shall be required to sign the copies of the inventory and be given a copy thereof;
- (2) Within twenty-four (24) hours upon confiscation/seizure of dangerous drugs, plant sources of dangerous drugs, controlled precursors and essential chemicals, as well as instruments/paraphernalia and/or laboratory equipment, the same shall be submitted to the PDEA Forensic Laboratory for a qualitative and quantitative examination;
- (3) A certification of the forensic laboratory examination results, which shall be done under oath by the forensic laboratory examiner, shall be issued within twenty-four (24) hours after the receipt of the subject item/s: *Provided*, That when the volume of the dangerous drugs, plant sources of dangerous drugs, and controlled precursors and essential chemicals does not allow the completion of testing within the time frame, a partial laboratory examination report shall be provisionally issued stating therein the quantities of dangerous drugs still to be examined by the forensic laboratory: *Provided, however*, That a final certification shall be issued on the completed forensic laboratory examination on the same within the next twenty-four (24) hours[.]

Compliance with the chain of custody requirements assures that the identity of the seized items is preserved; that is, that the item seized during

⁴² *People v. Sagana*, 815 Phil. 356, 367–368 (2017) [Per J. Leonen, Second Division].

⁴³ Republic Act No. 9165 has been amended by Republic Act No. 10640. But since the buy-bust operation was conducted in 2012, the original text of the law applies. See *People v. Pantallano*, G.R. No. 233800, March 6, 2019, <<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/65009>> [Per J. A. Reyes, Jr., Third Division].

the illegal transaction and taken from the accused is the same one presented in court. In *People v. Que*:⁴⁴

[T]he Prosecution must account for the custody of the incriminating evidence from the moment of seizure and confiscation until the moment it is offered in evidence. That account goes to the weight of evidence. It is not enough that the evidence offered has probative value on the issues, for the evidence must also be sufficiently connected to and tied with the facts in issue. The evidence is not relevant merely because it is available but that it has an actual connection with the transaction involved and with the parties thereto. This is the reason why authentication and laying a foundation for the introduction of evidence are important.⁴⁵

The chain of custody rule is all the more important given the physical characteristics and fungible nature of dangerous drugs, especially when only minuscule amounts are involved. With the need for a more stringent standard of authentication,⁴⁶ compliance with the rule ensures the integrity of the confiscated items in their nature, quantity, relation to the incident and to the accused.⁴⁷ It thwarts the possibility of planting, contaminating, or tampering evidence.⁴⁸ In *Mallillin v. People*:⁴⁹

[T]he likelihood of tampering, loss or mistake with respect to an exhibit is greatest when the exhibit is small and is one that has physical characteristics fungible in nature and similar in form to substances familiar to people in their daily lives. . . .

A unique characteristic of narcotic substances is that they are not readily identifiable as in fact they are subject to scientific analysis to determine their composition and nature. The Court cannot reluctantly close its eyes to the likelihood, or at least the possibility, that at any of the links in the chain of custody over the same there could have been tampering, alteration or substitution of substances from other cases – by accident or otherwise – in which similar evidence was seized or in which similar evidence was submitted for laboratory testing. Hence, in authenticating the same, a standard more stringent than that applied to cases involving objects which are readily identifiable must be applied, a more exacting standard that entails a chain of custody of the item with sufficient completeness if only to render it improbable that the original item has either been exchanged with another or been contaminated or tampered with.⁵⁰

The chain of custody rule is further expounded in the Implementing Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 9165. Together, the law and its implementing rules clearly require the apprehending officers to immediately

⁴⁴ 824 Phil. 882 (2018) [Per J. Leonen, Third Division].

⁴⁵ Id. at 896 citing *People v. Belocura*, 93 Phil. 476 (2012) [Per J. Bersamin, First Division].

⁴⁶ *People v. Holgado*, 741 Phil. 78, 93 (2014) [Per J. Leonen, Third Division].

⁴⁷ Id.

⁴⁸ Id.

⁴⁹ 576 Phil. 576 (2008) [Per J. Tinga, Second Division].

⁵⁰ Id. at 588–589.

inventory and photograph the drugs upon seizure. Not only that, but these procedures must be done at the place of arrest⁵¹ to preclude the possibility of planting, contaminating, or tampering the object evidence.

Here, the records do not show that the apprehending officers inventoried and photographed the seized items immediately after the arrest and seizure. In fact, they brought accused-appellants to the police station first to conduct booking and documentation before conducting the required tasks. This is a clear violation of the requirements under Republic Act No. 9165, producing doubts as to the integrity of the seized narcotics.

Moreover, Section 21 requires the presence of these third-party witnesses during the inventory: (1) a media representative; (2) a Department of Justice representative; and (3) an elected public official.⁵² This requirement serves as an “insulating presence against the evils of switching, ‘planting’ or contamination.”⁵³ Their presence safeguards the buy-bust operation’s integrity. In *People v. Sagana*:⁵⁴

Their presence in buy-bust operations and seizure of illicit articles in the place of operation would supposedly guarantee “against planting of evidence and frame up.” In other words, they are necessary to insulate the apprehension and incrimination proceedings from any taint of illegitimacy or irregularity.

To underscore, the prosecution “has the positive duty to establish that earnest efforts were employed in contacting the representatives enumerated under Section 21. . . or that there was justifiable ground for failure to do so.”⁵⁵ (Citations omitted)

Here, the apprehending team utterly failed to secure the presence of the third-party witnesses at the time of seizure and inventory of the dangerous articles. All it has shown is that a certain Rebecca C. Cabading of the Dagupan City Prosecution Office signed the confiscation receipts, which were prepared at the police station.

Granted, the Implementing Rules and Regulations allows noncompliance when there are justifiable grounds.⁵⁶ Its Section 21(a) provides that noncompliance “under justifiable grounds, as long as the

⁵¹ *People v. Luna*, 828 Phil. 671, 695 (2018). See *People v. Banding*, G.R. No. 233470, August 14, 2019, <<http://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/65513>> [Per J. Leonen, Third Division].

⁵² The prevailing law at the time of the incident is Republic Act No. 9165 (2001), sec. 21(1) without the amendments introduced by Republic Act No. 10640 (2014), sec. 1(a). See *People v. Pantallano*, G.R. No. 233800, March 6, 2019, <<http://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/65009>> [Per J. A. Reyes, Jr., Third Division].

⁵³ *People v. Que*, 824 Phil. 882, 911 (2018) [Per J. Leonen, Third Division] citing *People v. Mendoza*, 736 Phil. 749 (2014) [Per J. Bersamin, First Division].

⁵⁴ 815 Phil. 356 (2017) [Per J. Leonen, Second Division].

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 372–373.

⁵⁶ Implementing Rules and Regulations of Republic Act No. 9165 (2002), sec. 21(a).

integrity and the evidentiary value of the seized items are properly preserved by the apprehending officer/team, shall not render void and invalid such seizures of and custody over said items[.]” As expounded in *Que*:

In order that there may be conscionable non-compliance, two (2) requisites must be satisfied: first, the prosecution must specifically allege, identify, and prove “justifiable grounds”; second, it must establish that despite non-compliance, the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized drugs and/or drug paraphernalia were properly preserved. Satisfying the second requisite demands a showing of positive steps taken to ensure such preservation. Broad justifications and sweeping guarantees will not suffice.⁵⁷

The prosecution must allege and prove the excusable instance and show that this did not affect the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized drugs. That did not happen here. The records do not show any attempt to justify the police officers’ fatal deviation from Section 21’s requirements. Neither did the prosecution offer any explanation for why the law enforcers disregarded their mandate of immediately conducting inventory upon seizure the drugs, and ensuring the presence of all the third-party witnesses.

Taken with the lack of photographs, such glaring lapse cannot be ignored. Together, these deviations cast serious doubts on the identity and integrity of the drug allegedly seized from accused-appellants. They amount to a failure to establish the *corpus delicti*, an essential element of illegal sale and possession of dangerous drugs.⁵⁸

The prosecution’s duty of establishing guilt beyond reasonable doubt emanates from the accused’s constitutional right⁵⁹ to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. Given the law enforcers’ unjustified lapses in handling the seized items as required by Section 21 of Republic Act No. 9165, the prosecution has failed to discharge its burden. Without proof of the *corpus delicti*, there can be no proof of the crime. This Court is, therefore, constrained to acquit accused-appellants.

WHEREFORE, the Court of Appeals’ December 20, 2017 Decision in CA-G.R. CR-HC No. 08487 is **REVERSED** and **SET ASIDE**. Accused-appellants Jojie Baylon y Castro and Jay-Ar Baylon y Castro are **ACQUITTED** for the prosecution’s failure to prove their guilt beyond

⁵⁷ *People v. Que*, 824 Phil. 882, 913 (2018) [Per J. Leonen, Third Division].

⁵⁸ *People v. Morales*, 630 Phil. 215, 229 (2010) [Per J. Del Castillo, Second Division].

⁵⁹ CONST., art. III, sec. 14(2) provides:

(2) In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall be presumed innocent until the contrary is proved, and shall enjoy the right to be heard by himself and counsel, to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation against him, to have a speedy, impartial, and public trial, to meet the witnesses face to face, and to have compulsory process to secure the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence in his behalf. However, after arraignment, trial may proceed notwithstanding the absence of the accused provided that he has been duly notified and his failure to appear is unjustifiable.

reasonable doubt. They are ordered immediately **RELEASED** from detention unless confined for any other lawful cause.

Let a copy of this Resolution be furnished to the Director of the Bureau of Corrections for immediate implementation. The Director of the Bureau of Corrections is directed to report to this Court the action taken within five days from receipt of this Resolution. Copies shall also be furnished to the Director General of the Philippine National Police and the Director General of the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency for their information.

The Regional Trial Court is directed to turn over the seized sachets of shabu to the Dangerous Drugs Board for destruction in accordance with law.

Let entry of final judgment be issued immediately.

SO ORDERED.” (Peralta, C.J. vice Carandang, J., per Raffle dated July 13, 2020.)

By authority of the Court:

Mis DDC Batt
MISAELO DOMINGO C. BATTUNG III
Division Clerk of Court
5 ER
16/13/20

Atty. Eloisa C. Palmones
PUBLIC ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
Special & Appealed Cases Service
DOJ Agencies Building
East Avenue cor. NIA Road
Diliman, 1104 Quezon City

COURT OF APPEALS
CA G.R. CR HC No. 08487
1000 Manila

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL
134 Amorsolo Street
Legaspi Village, 1229 Makati City

The Director General
BUREAU OF CORRECTIONS
1770 Muntinlupa City

CSSupt. Gerardo F. Padilla
Superintendent
New Bilibid Prison
BUREAU OF CORRECTIONS
1770 Muntinlupa City

The Superintendent
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN
1550 Mandaluyong City

Ms. Jojie Baylon y Castro,
The Superintendent
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN
1550 Mandaluyong City

Mr. Jay-Ar Baylon y Castro
c/o The Superintendent
New Bilibid Prison
BUREAU OF CORRECTIONS
1770 Muntinlupa City

The Presiding Judge
REGIONAL TRIAL COURT
Branch 44, 2400 Dagupan City
(Criminal Case No. 2012-0014-D)

The Director General
PHILIPPINE NATIONAL POLICE
National Headquarters
Camp Crame, Quezon City

The Director General
PHILIPPINE DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
PDEA Bldg., NIA Northside Road
National Government Center
Brgy. Pinyahan, Quezon City

DANGEROUS DRUGS BOARD
3rd Floor DDB-PDEA Bldg.,
NIA Northside Road
National Government Center
Brgy. Pinyahan, Quezon City

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE
Supreme Court, Manila
[For uploading pursuant to A.M. 12-7-1-SC]

LIBRARY SERVICES
Supreme Court, Manila

Judgment Division
JUDICIAL RECORDS OFFICE
Supreme Court, Manila

G.R. No. 242476

len/

gale

61
(144)
URES