

## REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES SUPREME COURT Manila

## SECOND DIVISION

## NOTICE

## Sirs/Mesdames:

Please take notice that the Court, Second Division, issued a Resolution dated **27 July 2020** which reads as follows:

"G.R. No. 252081 (People of the Philippines  $\nu$ . Rufino Westrimundo Tabayoyong, Jr.). – After a judicious study of the case, the Court resolves to DENY the instant petition<sup>1</sup> and AFFIRM the August 30, 2019<sup>2</sup> and February 6, 2020<sup>3</sup> Resolutions of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. SP No. 162068 for failure of petitioner to sufficiently show that the CA committed any reversible error in dismissing its petition for being filed out of time.

As correctly ruled by the CA, the petition was belatedly filed, considering that, based on the records, petitioner received<sup>4</sup> a copy of the assailed April 12, 2018 Order<sup>5</sup> of the Regional Trial Court of Urdaneta City, Pangasinan, Branch 46 (RTC) on April 1, 2019,<sup>6</sup> thereby giving it until May 31, 2019, or sixty (60) days from its receipt thereof, within which to file the petition. However, the petition was filed only on August 22, 2019,<sup>7</sup> or eighty-three (83) days thereafter, and petitioner has offered no adequate explanation to justify such failure. Moreover, since the assailed Order granting the motion to quash the search warrant is a final order, the proper remedy is to file an appeal and not a petition for *certiorari*.<sup>8</sup> It is settled that a special civil action for *certiorari* under Rule 65 lies only when there is no appeal nor [any] plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. *Certiorari* cannot be allowed when a party to a case fails to appeal a judgment despite the availability of that remedy, *certiorari* not being a substitute for lost appeal.<sup>9</sup> Perforce, the instant petition must be denied.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> *Rollo*, pp. 21-45.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Id. at 51-54. Penned by Associate Justice Walter S. Ong with Associate Justices Pablito A. Perez and Germano Francisco D. Legaspi, concurring.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Id. at 56-58.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Through the Office of the Provincial Prosecutor of Urdaneta City.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Rollo, pp. 82-84. Signed by Presiding Judge Tita Rodriguez-Villarin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See id. at 52.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See id.

See Worldwide Web Corporation v. People, 724 Phil. 18-46 (2014).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> *Republic v. CA*, 379 Phil. 92-102 (2000).

Very truly yours, G MAR TERESITA **JUINO TUAZON** Deputy Division Clerk of Court 13 AUG 2020

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (reg) 134 Amorsolo Street 1229 Legaspi Village Makati City

ATTY. DANI JAY REBUGIO (reg) Counsel for Respondent 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Soriano Motorshop Building Arcangel Street, Poblacion 2428 Urdaneta City, Pangasinan

HON. PRESIDING JUDGE (reg) Regional Trial Court, Branch 46 Urdaneta City, Pangasinan (Crim. Case No. U-23464) COURT OF APPEALS (x) Ma. Orosa Street Ermita, 1000 Manila CA-G.R. SP No. 162068

JUDGMENT DIVISION (x) Supreme Court, Manila

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE (x) LIBRARY SERVICES (x) [For uploading pursuant to A.M. No. 12-7-SC]

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ATTORNEY (x) OFFICE OF THE REPORTER (x) Supreme Court, Manila

*Please notify the Court of any change in your address.* GR252081. 07/27/20 (150)URES