

SECOND DIVISION

[G.R. No. 206366, August 13, 2014]

**PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, APPELLEE, VS. EDUARDO
BALAQUIT Y BALDERAMA, APPELLANT.**

D E C I S I O N

PEREZ, J.:

At bench is an appeal^[1] assailing the Decision^[2] dated 29 August 2012 of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CR-H.C. No. 04595. In the said decision, the appellate court affirmed the conviction of herein appellant Eduardo B. Balaquit for violation of Section 5 of Republic Act No. 9165 or the *Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002*.

The facts are as follows:

On 11 June 2008, appellant was arrested during a buy bust operation performed by officers of the Philippine National Police (PNP) in Camiling, Tarlac. He was thereafter charged with the offense of illegal sale of *shabu* under an Information filed before the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Tarlac.^[3] The Information reads:

That on June 11, 2008 at on or about 10 AM at Bobon 1st, in the Municipality of Camiling, Province of Tarlac, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the said accused, did then and there willfully and feloniously sell to one another one (1) heat sealed plastic sachet containing 0.049 grams of met[h]amphetamine hydrochloride commonly known as "shabu", a dangerous drug, without being authorized by law.

Appellant was arraigned on 26 August 2008 and entered a plea of not guilty. Trial thereafter ensued.

During trial, the prosecution presented, among others, the following object evidence:

1. One (1) heat-sealed transparent plastic sachet containing 0.049 grams of white crystalline substance. The plastic sachet is dated "11 June 2008" and marked with "JSE-EBB,"^[4] and
2. Chemistry Report D-184-08^[5]

The foregoing object evidence were supplemented by the testimonies of Police

Officer Jay Espiritu (PO3 Espiritu), Special Police Officer Noli Daraman (SPO1 Daraman) and police chemist Jebie Timario (Mr. Timario).

PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman were the police officers who conducted the buy-bust operation that led to the arrest of the appellant. Their testimonies recounted the following events:^[6]

1. On 11 June 2008, PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman engaged in a buy-bust operation against appellant after receiving confirmation from the Chief Intelligence Officer (CIO) of the Camiling PNP that the former was involved in the peddling of *shabu*. The confirmation from the CIO came at the heels of a week-long surveillance on the appellant conducted by the Camiling PNP.
2. As the designated poseur-buyer of the operation, PO3 Espiritu met with the appellant outside the latter's residence at Bobon 1st, Camiling, Tarlac. SPO1 Daraman, on the other hand, hid behind a tree about ten (10) to twenty (20) meters from where PO3 Espiritu and appellant were standing.
3. PO3 Espiritu was able to negotiate and successfully purchase from the appellant one (1) heat-sealed transparent plastic sachet. In exchange, PO3 Espiritu handed to the appellant a previously marked P500 bill. After the transaction, PO3 Espiritu proceeded to arrest appellant. SPO1 Daraman, who was able to witness the exchange, emerged from his hiding place and aided in the arrest of the appellant.
4. PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman retrieved from appellant the marked P500 bill. They then proceeded to call the *barangay* officials of the place to witness the inventory of the plastic sachet containing white crystalline substance and the marked money. Photographs of the plastic sachet, the marked bill and of the appellant were also taken.
5. PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman brought the appellant and the recovered items to the Camiling PNP station. The plastic sachet containing white crystalline substance were then dated "11 June 2008" and marked with "JSE-EBB"—the initials of both PO3 Espiritu and the appellant.
6. On 12 June 2008, PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 forwarded to the PNP Crime Laboratory the plastic sachet, now dated "11 June 2008" and marked "JSE-EBB," along with a request for laboratory examination.

In his testimony, PO3 Espiritu also identified the plastic sachet dated "11 June 2008" and marked with "JSE-EBB" presented by the prosecution as the very one he retrieved from the appellant during the buy-bust.^[7]

Mr. Timario, on the other hand, is a police chemist for the Camiling PNP and the one who conducted laboratory examination on the contents of the plastic sachet dated "11 June 2008" and marked "JSE-EBB." He is also the signatory of Chemistry Report D-184-08. Mr. Timario testified that per Chemistry Report D-184-08, he was able to confirm that the contents of the plastic sachet dated "11 June 2008" and marked "JSE-EBB" are positive for methamphetamine hydrochloride or *shabu*.^[8]

The defense, for its part, relied on the testimonies of the appellant and his brother, Exequil Balaquit (Exequil).

In substance, appellant denied being caught, *in flagrante*, selling *shabu* and claimed that he was merely a victim of a police frame-up. He professed the following version of events:^[9]

1. On the date and time of the supposed buy-bust, he was in a day care center where he bought some *sopas* for his children. On his way home, he encountered two (2) men aboard a motorcycle.
2. One of the two (2) men aboard the motorcycle alighted and drew a gun at him. At that point, SPO1 Daraman arrived and introduced himself and the one pointing a gun at him as policemen.
3. Afterwards, SPO1 Daraman and other police officers led him to an alley. One of the police officers twisted his arms. At the alley, he was forced to sign a report. Later, the barangay captain also arrived and signed the same report.
4. He was then brought to the Camiling PNP station where he was detained.

Exequil corroborated the denial of his brother. He recounted that he saw the appellant, arm-twisted and all, being led to an alley by police officers.^[10]

On 24 June 2010, the RTC rendered a decision^[11] finding appellant guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the offense of illegal sale of shabu under Section 5^[12] of the *Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002*. In doing so, the RTC gave full faith and credence to the version of the prosecution as established by the testimonies of PO3 Espiritu, SPO1 Daraman and Mr. Timario. Accordingly, the RTC sentenced appellant to suffer the penalty of life imprisonment and to pay a fine of P500,000.00.

Aggrieved, appellant appealed the RTC decision to the CA.

On 29 August 2012, the CA rendered a decision affirming the RTC. Hence, this appeal.

In this appeal, appellant claims that the RTC and the CA erred in giving full faith and credence to the version of the prosecution. To support his claim, he cites three (3) circumstances:

1. The prosecution never presented as a witness the CIO of the Camiling PNP.
2. The Camiling PNP never coordinated with the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA).
3. The representation by the prosecution that the appellant was under surveillance prior to the buy-bust is not believable. If it were true, then the

Camiling PNP could have just applied for a search warrant against the appellant.

These circumstances, the appellant believes, destroy the credibility of the prosecution story that the Camiling PNP really undertook a genuine buy-bust operation and also lend trustworthiness to his own version that he was merely a victim of a frame-up.

At any rate, the appellant adds that his acquittal for the two charges is in order because the prosecution failed to prove the *corpus delicti* of the offense charged. Appellant claims that the identity of the *shabu* that was presented by the prosecution in evidence is suspect in view of the failure by PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman to mark the plastic sachet they allegedly retrieved during the buy-bust immediately thereat as required by Section 21^[13] of the *Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002*. Appellant points out that PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman, by their own testimonies, admitted to marking such plastic sachet only after bringing the same to the police station.

OUR RULING

We deny the appeal.

The RTC and the Court of Appeals did not err in giving full faith and credence to the testimony of the prosecution witnesses

We find no error on the part of the RTC and the CA in sustaining the prosecution's version of events. The circumstances cited by the appellant does not at all destroy its credibility:

First. The non-presentation as a witness of the CIO of the Camiling PNP does not discount that a legitimate buy-bust operation was undertaken in this case. The conduct of the buy-bust operation was already adequately established by the testimonies of PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman who were the very participants of such operation. Indeed, the testimony of the CIO would, at most, merely corroborate the testimonies of PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman.

Second. The appellant's qualm regarding the absence of coordination between the Camiling PNP and the PDEA is also immaterial. In *People v. Roa*,^[14] this Court ruled that prior coordination with the PDEA is not a condition *sine qua non* for the validity of every entrapment operation conducted by police authorities:

In the first place, coordination with the PDEA is not an indispensable requirement before police authorities may carry out a buy-bust operation. While it is true that Section 86^[15] of Republic Act No. 9165 requires the National Bureau of Investigation, PNP and the Bureau of Customs to maintain "close coordination with the PDEA on all drug related matters," the provision does not, by so saying, make PDEA's participation a condition *sine qua non* for every buy-bust operation. After all, a buy-bust is just a form of an *in flagrante* arrest sanctioned by

Section 5, Rule 113^[16] of the Rules of the Court, which police authorities may rightfully resort to in apprehending violators of Republic Act No. 9165 in support of the PDEA.^[17] A buy-bust operation is not invalidated by mere non-coordination with the PDEA.

Third. The assertion that the Camiling PNP could have just applied for a search warrant instead of conducting a buy-bust operation is irrelevant to the issue of whether a legitimate buy-bust operation was, in fact, undertaken. The decision whether to apply for a search warrant or to conduct instead a buy-bust operation on any given case is a matter rightfully addressed to the sound discretion of the police officers. Certainly, police officers have the right to choose which legal means or processes are best suited, given the circumstances, in accomplishing the task they are called upon to perform.

Verily, appellant is left with only his denial to fend off the serious accusations against him. Such denial, by itself, however, cannot overcome the weight traditionally accorded to affirmative testimonies by police officers with unsullied credibility.^[18] The RTC and the CA were, therefore, correct in giving full faith and credit to the open court narrations of PO3 Espiritu and SPO1 Daraman.

***Corpus delicti of the offense
proven beyond reasonable doubt***

We also find that the *corpus delicti* of the offense was adequately proven in this case.

A review of the evidence on record will show that the prosecution was able to establish an unbroken chain of custody over the *shabu* that it claims as having been sold by the appellant:

1. PO3 Espiritu testified that he was able to buy P500.00 worth of *shabu* inside a transparent plastic sachet from appellant, which he brought to the Camiling PNP station.^[19]
2. Upon arrival at the station, PO3 Espiritu testified that he dated the plastic sachet "11 June 2008" and marked it with "JSE-EBB." Afterwards, a request for laboratory examination was prepared.^[20]
3. The next day, plastic sachet dated "11 June 2008" and marked "JSE-EBB" was sent to the PNP Crime Laboratory along with the request for laboratory examination.^[21]
4. At the PNP Crime Laboratory, Mr. Timario conducted examination on the contents of the plastic sachet dated "11 June 2008" and marked "JSE-EBB" that yielded positive results for *shabu*.^[22]
5. Afterwards, the *shabu* was retrieved for purposes of the trial.^[23]