

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 150606, June 07, 2007]

**STATE PROSECUTOR AND SPECIAL PROSECUTOR ON SSS CASES
IN REGION V, ROMULO SJ. TOLENTINO, AND REGIONAL STATE
PROSECUTOR SANTIAGO M. TURINGAN, AS *ALTER EGO* OF THE
SECRETARY OF JUSTICE IN REGION V, IN THEIR OFFICIAL
CAPACITIES, AND, FOR AND IN REPRESENTATION OF THE
PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES AND MARITES C. DE LA TORRE, IN
HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS COUNSEL FOR THE COMPLAINANT,
SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM (SSS) BICOL CLUSTER,
PETITIONERS, PROMULGATED: VS. HON. PABLO M. PAQUEO, JR.,
IN HIS CAPACITY AS PRESIDING JUDGE OF RTC, BRANCH 23, OF
THE CITY OF NAGA, AND ACCUSED BENEDICT DY TECKLO,
RESPONDENTS.**

DECISION

AZCUNA, J.:

This is a petition for *certiorari* and mandamus alleging that respondent Judge Pablo M. Paqueo, Jr., Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Naga City, Branch 23, acted with grave abuse of discretion amounting to lack or excess of jurisdiction in issuing the Orders dated August 24, 2001 and October 15, 2001. The Order dated August 24, 2001 granted the Motion to Quash of private respondent Benedict Dy Tecklo, thus dismissing the Information filed by petitioner State Prosecutor Romulo SJ. Tolentino. The Order dated October 15, 2001 denied State Prosecutor Tolentino's Objection and Motion dated September 5, 2001.

The facts are:

On June 22, 2001, petitioner State Prosecutor Romulo SJ. Tolentino filed an Information charging private respondent Benedict Dy Tecklo, the owner/proprietor of Qualistronic Builders, of violation of Sec. 22 (a) in relation to Sec. 28 (e) of Republic Act No. 8282^[1] for failing to remit the premiums due for his employee to the Social Security System despite demand.

The Information contains a certification by State Prosecutor Tolentino, thus:

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE REQUIRED INVESTIGATION IN THIS CASE HAS BEEN CONDUCTED BY THE UNDERSIGNED SPECIAL PROSECUTOR IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW AND UNDER OATH AS OFFICER OF THE COURT, THAT THERE IS REASONABLE GROUND TO BELIEVE THAT THE OFFENSE HAS BEEN COMMITTED, THAT THE ACCUSED IS PROBABLY GUILTY THEREOF **AND THAT THE FILING OF THE INFORMATION IS**

**WITH THE PRIOR AUTHORITY AND APPROVAL OF THE REGIONAL
STATE PROSECUTOR.^[2]**

The case was raffled to the RTC of Naga City, Branch 23, presided by respondent Judge Pablo M. Paqueo, Jr. It was set for arraignment on August 7, 2001. On said date, counsel for private respondent moved for the deferment of the arraignment and requested time to file a motion to quash the Information, which request was granted by the court.

On August 10, 2001, private respondent filed a Motion to Quash, thus:

Accused, through counsel, most respectfully moves to quash the Information x x x upon the sole ground that State Prosecutor Romulo SJ Tolentino, not being the City Prosecutor nor the Provincial Prosecutor, has no legal personality nor is he legally clothed with the authority to commence prosecution by the filing of the Information and thus prosecute the case.^[3]

On August 16, 2001, State Prosecutor Tolentino filed an Opposition to Motion to Quash^[4] on the following grounds:

(1) He (State Prosecutor Tolentino) is authorized to investigate, file the necessary Information and prosecute SSS cases since he was designated as Special Prosecutor for SSS cases by Regional State Prosecutor Santiago M. Turingan by virtue of Regional Order No. 97-024A dated July 14, 1997;

(2) In a letter^[5] dated October 24, 2000, Chief State Prosecutor Jovencito Zuño confirmed such authority and that Informations to be filed in court by prosecutors-designate do not need the approval of the Regional State Prosecutor or Provincial or City Prosecutor;

(3) Under the Administrative Code of 1987, the Regional State Prosecutor, as *alter ego* of the Secretary of Justice, is vested with authority to designate Special Prosecutors; and

(4) The City Prosecutor has been inhibited by the private complainant from investigating SSS Cases as it is the Panel of Prosecutors that is now acting as City Prosecutor over all city cases involving violations of the Social Security Act. As acting Prosecutor, the panel outranks the City Prosecutor.

On August 24, 2001, the RTC issued an Order quashing the Information and dismissing the case, thus:

For resolution is a motion to quash filed by x x x counsel for the accused, with an opposition to the same filed by State Prosecutor Romulo SJ. Tolentino, the prosecutor who filed the information.

The motion is based on the lack of legal personality of State Prosecutor Tolentino, [not being] legally clothed with the authority to commence prosecution by the filing of the information and, thus, prosecute the case.

One of the grounds provided by the rules to quash an Information is paragraph (c), of Sec. 3 of Rule 117.

"(c) that the officer who filed the information had no authority to do so."

A glance on the face of the information would glaringly show that it was filed by State Prosecutor Romulo Tolentino, without the approval of the City Prosecutor of Naga City, the situs of the crime, a blatant violation of the third paragraph of Sec. 4 of Rule 112 of the Revised Rules on Criminal Procedure.

An information filed by a qualified and authorized officer is required for the jurisdiction of the court over the case (*Villa v. Ibañez, et al.*, 88 Phil. 402).

A justification put up by State Prosecutor Tolentino is a Regional Order No. 07-024-A subject of which is the Designation of Personnel issued by the Regional State Prosecutor which in effect designated him as the special prosecutor to handle the investigation of all SSS cases filed before the Offices of the City Prosecutor of the Cities of Naga, Iriga and Legaspi and the Offices of the Provincial Prosecutor of the different provinces in the Bicol Region, except the provinces of Catanduanes and Masbate, and if evidence warrants to file the necessary information and prosecute the same in the court of [appropriate] jurisdiction.

The designation of State Prosecutor Tolentino to investigate, file this information if the evidence warrants, and to prosecute SSS cases in court does not exempt him from complying with the provision of the third paragraph of [Sec. 4 of] Rule 112 of the Revised Rules on Criminal Procedure, that no complaint or information may be filed or dismissed by an investigating prosecutor without the prior written authority or approval of the Provincial or City Prosecutor or Chief State Prosecutor or the Ombudsman or his deputy. The designation given to Prosecutor Tolentino came from the Regional Chief State Prosecutor [who] is not one of those mentioned exclusively by the Rules to approve in writing the filing or the dismissal of an information.

Also, as ruled by this court in a similar case which was dismissed, the second attached document supporting the opposition to the motion, is but an opinion of the Chief State prosecutor which has no force and effect to set aside the mandatory requirement of the Rules in the filing of an information in court.

WHEREFORE, in view of all the foregoing, the motion is granted, The information is hereby ordered quashed and dismissed.^[6]

Petitioner State Prosecutor Tolentino filed an Objection and Motion praying that the Order dated August 24, 2001 be set aside and that the case entitled *People v. Tecklo* be scheduled for arraignment without unnecessary delay.

In an Order dated October 15, 2001, respondent Judge denied Tolentino's Objection and Motion, thus:

For consideration is an Objection and Motion filed by State Prosecutor Romulo SJ. Tolentino, praying that the Order of this court dated August 24, 2001 be set aside and the case be scheduled for arraignment.

Acting on said motion upon receipt thereof, the court gave the defense a period of fifteen (15) days from receipt of the order dated September 18, 2001 to file its comment and/or opposition; however, the period lapsed with the court never receiving any comment and/or opposition from the defense.

The records show that the issue raised in the pleadings from both parties is whether Prosecutor Tolentino, in filing the information, can just ignore the provision of the third paragraph of Sec. 4 of Rule 112 of the Revised Rules on [C]riminal [P]rocedure.

It is the stand of this court, when it ruled and so holds that Prosecutor Tolentino may conduct exclusive investigation and prosecute all violations of the provisions of the SSS Laws within the Bicol Region, but in the filing of the information in court, he must comply with [x x x] the above-cited provision of the rules on criminal procedure, that is, to have the provincial or city prosecutor at the situs of the offense approve in writing said information. It was further ruled by this court that failure to secure said written authority of the provincial or city prosecutor would touch on the jurisdiction of this court.

With the foregoing, this court cannot find any legal basis to disturb its ruling of August 24, 2001. The instant objection and motion is therefore denied.

SO ORDERED.^[7]

Petitioners, thereafter, filed this petition praying for the nullification of the Orders dated August 24, 2001 and October 15, 2001.

The main issue in this case is whether or not petitioner State Prosecutor Tolentino is duly authorized to file the subject Information without the approval of the City Prosecutor?

In their Memorandum,^[8] petitioners allege that State Prosecutor Tolentino was duly authorized to file the Information based on the following:

1. Petitioner Regional State Prosecutor Santiago M. Turingan, per Regional Order dated July 14, 1997, authorized State Prosecutor Tolentino to file the necessary Information for violations of Republic Act No. 8282 in the Bicol Region, except Masbate and Catanduanes, and to prosecute the same in courts of competent jurisdiction. This was in response to the request of the SSS, Region V for the designation of a Special Prosecutor to handle the prosecution of said criminal cases with the Office of the City Prosecutor and Office