

# FIRST DIVISION

[ G.R. No. 243375, June 30, 2020 ]

**LUZVIMINDA LLAMADO Y VILLANA, PETITIONER, V. PEOPLE OF  
THE PHILIPPINES, RESPONDENT.**

## D E C I S I O N

**J. REYES, JR., J.:**

This resolves the petition for review on *certiorari* filed by petitioner Luzviminda Llamado y Villana (Llamado) from the Decision<sup>[1]</sup> dated May 31, 2018 of the Court of Appeals-Manila (CA) in CA-G.R. CR No. 39547 and the Resolution<sup>[2]</sup> dated November 28, 2018 affirming the Decision of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 156, Marikina City, in Criminal Case Nos. 2011-3921-D-MK and 2011-3922-D-MK finding Llamado guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the charge of illegal possession of dangerous drugs and paraphernalia, defined and penalized under Section 11 and 12, Art. II of Republic Act No. 9165<sup>[3]</sup> otherwise known as the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002.

### The Antecedents

On July 5, 2011, two separate Informations were filed before the RTC, Branch 156, Marikina City, in Criminal Case Nos. 2011-3921-D-MK & 2011-3922-D-MK. The two separate Informations read as follows:

In Crim. Case No. 2011-3921-D-MK  
(for violation of section 12 of R.A. 9165)

That on or about 1<sup>st</sup> day of July 2011, in the City of Marikina, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above named accused, without being authorized by law to possess or otherwise use any dangerous drugs, did then and there [willfully], unlawfully and knowingly have in her possession, direct custody and control one (1) black carton pencil case labelled Tomato; one strip of aluminum foil; one (1) disposable cigarette lighter labelled Torch; and one (1) improvised burner, which are instruments, apparatus or other paraphernalia fit or intended for smoking or introducing shabu, a dangerous drug, into the body and such were all found and recovered in the residence of the accused.

CONTRARY TO LAW.<sup>[4]</sup>

x x x x

In Crim. Case No. 2011-3922-D-MK  
(for violation of section 11 of R.A. 9165)

That on or about the 1<sup>st</sup> day of July 2011, in the City of Marikina, Philippines and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above named accused without being authorized by law to possess or otherwise use any dangerous drugs, did then and there [willfully], unlawfully and knowingly have in her possession, direct custody and control two (2) plastic sachets each containing 2.8853 grams and 2.8617 grams, respectively, of Methamphetamine Hydrochloride (shabu), a dangerous drug, in violation of the above cited law.

CONTRARY TO LAW.<sup>[5]</sup>

When arraigned, Llamado pleaded not guilty to the charge. After the Pre-Trial conference, trial on the merits ensued.

### **Version of the Prosecution**

According to the prosecution, Llamado became a person of interest in their anti-drug campaign after an informant reported a certain "Minda" allegedly involved in illegal drug activities in the vicinity of Barangays Sto. Nino and Concepcion Uno, Marikina City and nearby localities.

Upon obtaining information from a regular confidential informant, Agent Macairap, sought the permission of his Regional Director to verify the information disclosed. He then immediately organized a team to conduct a surveillance, upon which, a test-buy operation conducted was completed and the pieces of evidence obtained therewith was sent to the crime laboratory and yielded positive results for methamphetamine hydrochloride. When the results of the laboratory examination was obtained, Agent Macairap applied for a search warrant against Llamado, with address at No. 56 Exequiel Street, Brgy. Sto. Niño, Marikina City. A search warrant was then issued by Judge Amor A. Reyes.

For the implementation of the said search warrant, Intelligence Officer 1 Randolph Cordovilla ("IO1 Cordovilla") was designated as seizing officer against the premises where Llamado a.k.a. Minda resides. The team was led by Intelligence Agent 3 Liwanag B. Sandaan, (IA3 Sandaan). The team proceeded to the subject premises after proper coordination with the Marikina police and the presence of *Barangay Kagawad* Wilfredo Santos. Upon arrival at the subject premises, IO1 Cordovilla saw the main door of the accused open. After securing the entire perimeter of the place, IO1 Cordovilla entered the house. He saw that there was no one in the first floor so he immediately went to the second floor where he saw the accused. The search warrant was presented to Llamado and search commenced in the second floor of the house. There he found one black carton pencil case, labeled "tomato," containing two heat-sealed transparent plastic sachet containing white crystalline substance suspected to be *shabu*, one aluminum foil strip with white residue, and one white disposable lighter, labeled "torch," used as improvised burner. In the ground floor of the house, IO1 Cordovilla found one improvised burner on top of the hanging cabinet. The items were marked and inventoried in the presence of Agent Almerino, accused Llamado and *Kagawad* Wilfredo Santos. Immediately thereafter, accused was arrested by Special Investigation Agent John Jenne Almerino (SI Almerino). The team thereafter went back to the Philippine Drugs Enforcement Agency (PDEA) main office in Quezon City.

The laboratory examination conducted by Forensic Chemist Jasmyne Lora M. Jaranilla (Jaranilla) on the specimen taken from the house of the accused yielded positive results for methamphetamine hydrochloride. These are the following:

A- One (1) heat-sealed transparent plastic sachet with markings EXH-A-1 RCC 7-1-2011 containing white crystalline substance with a net weight of 2.8853 grams.

B- One (1) heat-sealed transparent plastic sachet with markings EXH-A-2 RCC 7-1-2011 containing white crystalline substance with a net weight of 2.8617 grams.

C- One (1) strip of aluminum foil with markings EXH-A-3 RCC 7-1-2011 with traces of white residue.

The urine testing on the accused also yielded positive results for the said banned substance.<sup>[6]</sup>

### **Version of the Defense**

On the other hand, Llamado denied the allegations hurled against her and offered a different account of what transpired.

According to Llamado, her house was located at No. 56 Exequiel St., Brgy. Concepcion Uno, Marikina City.

On July 1, 2011 at around 8:00 p.m., she was sleeping beside her grandson inside the room of her house when she was awakened by PDEA operatives who entered the room. She was not familiar with them. She asked them for their purpose. One of them told her that they were looking for *shabu* inside her house. They did not present any search warrant to her.

As the search ensued, the things inside the house were in disarray. Accused was brought downstairs and was instructed to sit on top of a table. She was asked by one of the officers where she hid the shabu. She replied that she had no knowledge of such. One of the operatives said, "*heto sa iyo di ba?*" exhibiting a transparent plastic sachet containing suspected *shabu*. She dismissed the claim of the operative saying that it was the first time she saw the sachet of *shabu*. She was about to be taken outside the house when a local official of the *barangay* and Vice Mayor Fabian Cadiz arrived. Thereafter, she was brought to the PDEA main office where she was further investigated.

While inside the PDEA, accused was asked where and from whom she got the prohibited drug. She was also asked to produce the amount of P150,000.00 to settle her case. She denied ownership of the drug and also added that she did not have the money they were asking for. She was transported back to Marikina City for inquest at the City Prosecutor's Office.

### **Ruling of the Trial Court**

On September 20, 2016, the RTC of Marikina City, Branch 156, convicted Llamado for Possession of Dangerous Drugs, and Possession of Equipment, Instrument, Apparatus and Other Paraphernalia for Dangerous Drugs punished under Sections 11 and 12, Art. II of R.A. No. 9165 or the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002. According to the RTC, the prosecution was able to establish the guilt of

Llamado beyond reasonable doubt. The dispositive portion of the RTC Decision reads:

**WHEREFORE**, premises considered, the Court hereby renders judgment as follows:

(1) In Criminal Case No. 2011-3921-D-MK, finding the accused LUZVIMINDA LLAMADO y VILLANA guilty beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 12, Art. II of RA 9165, sentencing the said accused to an indeterminate prison term of SIX (6) MONTHS ad ONE (1) DAY to TWO (2) YEARS and a fine of P10,000;

(2) In Criminal Case No. 2011-3922-D-MK, finding the accused LUZVIMINDA LLAMADO y VILLANA guilty beyond reasonable doubt of violation of Section 11, Art. II. Of RA 9165, sentencing the said accused to an indeterminate prison term of TWENTY (20) YEARS and ONE (1) DAY to TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS and a fine of P400,000.00.

Said sentences shall be served simultaneously.

The shabu and drug paraphernalia subject of these cases are forfeited in favor of the government for proper disposal. Let a copy of this Decision be furnished the PDEA, the Office of the Vice Mayor of Marikina City, and the National Police Commission (NAPOLCOM).

[SO ORDERED].

The RTC accentuated that the evidence for the prosecution showed the presence of all the elements of the crimes of Possession of Dangerous Drugs, and Possession of Equipment, Instrument, Apparatus and Other Paraphernalia for Dangerous Drugs respectively punished under Sections 11 and 12 of the comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002.

Aggrieved, accused-appellant appealed to the Court of Appeals.

### **Ruling of the CA**

Subsequently, on May 31, 2018, the Court of Appeals rendered its Decision, affirming Llamado's conviction of the crimes charged. Echoing the trial court's findings, the CA affirmed that all the facts proven, and taken together prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt.

Llamado contended that the articles seized from her residence were inadmissible as evidence because to her, the search warrant was invalid for failing to describe the place to be searched with particularity. To recall, the address indicated in the search warrant was "56 Exequiel Street, *Brgy. Sto Niño*, Marikina City", while the address of the accused-appellant was "56 Exequiel Street, *Brgy. Concepcion Uno*, Marikina City".

Furthermore, accused-appellant contended that there was non compliance with the mandatory requirement of the presence of third party representatives because *Barangay Kagawad* Santos arrived at the scene only after the illegal substances and the paraphernalia were confiscated by the authorities in contravention with the proper procedure that he should have been present at the time of the search and seizure.

In addition, accused-appellant avers that there was a broken link in the chain of custody of the allegedly seized sachet of methamphetamine hydrochloride because there was no testimony with regard to how the seized items were managed, store, preserved, labeled and recorded after the chemical analysis by Forensic Chemist Jasmyne Lora M. Jaranilla. The dispositive portion of which provides:

**WHEREFORE**, premises considered, the *Appeal* filed by Luzviminda Llamado y Villana on 24 October 2016 is **DENIED**. The *Decision* rendered by the Regional Trial Court , Branch 156, Marikina City on 20 September 2016 in Criminal Case Nos. 2011-3921-22-D-MK is AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

Petitioner Llamado moved for reconsideration which was, however, denied by the CA in a Resolution<sup>[7]</sup> dated November 28, 2018; hence the instant petition.

### **The Issue**

The pivotal issue for this Court's resolution is whether or not Llamado's conviction for illegal possession of dangerous drugs and paraphernalia defined and penalized under Section 11 and 12, Article II of R.A. No. 9165, should be upheld.

### **Our Ruling**

We resolve to acquit petitioner Llamado on the ground of reasonable doubt.

Jurisprudence dictates that to secure a conviction for illegal possession of dangerous drugs under Sec. 11, Art. II of R.A. 9165, the prosecution must establish the following: (1) the accused is in possession of an item or object that is identified to be a prohibited drug; (2) such possession is not authorized by law; and (3) the accused freely and consciously possesses the said drug.<sup>[8]</sup> On the one hand, the elements of illegal possession of equipment, instrument, apparatus and other paraphernalia for dangerous drugs under Sec. 12 are the following: (1) possession or control by the accused of any equipment, apparatus or other paraphernalia fit or intended for smoking, consuming, administering, injecting, ingesting, or introducing any dangerous drug into the body; and (2) such possession is not authorized by law.<sup>[9]</sup> The CA ruled that all the elements of the offenses charged against appellants were established with moral certainty.<sup>[10]</sup>

To secure conviction for the aforementioned offenses, the existence of the drug or drug paraphernalia is of supreme importance such that no drug case can be successfully prosecuted and no judgment of conviction can be validly sustained without the identity of the dangerous substance being established with moral certainty, it being the very *corpus delicti* of the violation of the law.<sup>[11]</sup> There must be a clear showing that "it is the very thing that is possessed by the accused" (illegal possession).<sup>[12]</sup> Thus, the chain of custody over the confiscated drugs or paraphernalia must be sufficiently proved.

The Dangerous Drugs Board Regulation No. 1, Series of 2002, defines chain of custody as "duly recorded authorized movements and custody of seized drugs or controlled chemicals or plant sources of dangerous drugs or laboratory equipment of each stage, from the time of seizure/confiscation to receipt in the forensic laboratory to safekeeping, to presentation in court for destruction."