

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. No. 195239, March 07, 2012]

PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. BEN RUBIO Y ACOSTA, ACCUSED-APPELLANT.

D E C I S I O N

VELASCO JR., J.:

The Case

This is an appeal from the July 26, 2010 Decision^[1] of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CR-H.C. No. 03489, which affirmed *in toto* the June 30, 2008 Decision^[2] in Criminal Case No. 117310-H of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 261 in Pasig City. The RTC found accused Ben Rubio y Acosta (Rubio) guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of Rape.

The Facts

On January 6, 2006, Rubio was charged before the RTC with qualified rape. The accusatory portion of the Information provides:

On or about January 8, 2000, in Pasig City and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the defendant, being her father, with lewd design and by means of force, violence and intimidation, did then and there willfully, unlawfully and feloniously have sexual intercourse with [AAA],^[3] 15 years old, against her will and consent.

Contrary to Law.^[4]

Upon arraignment, Rubio pleaded "not guilty." During the pre-trial conference, Rubio admitted being the father of private complainant AAA and that she was under eighteen (18) years of age when the alleged rape happened. Trial ensued.

Through the testimony of AAA, it was established that on January 8, 2000 at around two o'clock in the afternoon, she was sleeping inside their house with her two-year old sister and three-year old brother, when the accused approached her and removed her shorts and panty. AAA tried to push him away but he was too strong, and he succeeded in inserting his penis inside her vagina. AAA continued resisting despite being afraid that the accused would hurt her. After some time, the accused ejaculated outside her vagina.

At around four o'clock in the afternoon of the same day, AAA went to a neighbor, a certain "*Kuya Gene*" who is a *Barangay Tanod*, and informed him that she was raped

by her own father. They then proceeded to the *Barangay* Hall and to the Police Headquarters to file a complaint against her father.^[5]

AAA further testified that she did not tell her mother about the incident, because she knew the latter would not believe her. AAA averred that she was first raped by her father in 1993, and when she reported this to her mother, she was casually told to forget about the incident, because it would bring shame to their family.^[6]

Dr. Emmanuel Reyes, a medico-legal expert who examined the private complainant after the alleged rape incident, testified that he found a shallow-healed laceration at a three o'clock position as well as a deep-healed laceration at a six o'clock position on the complainant's labia minora which showed that she had been subjected to numerous sexual assaults.^[7]

For the defense, Rubio took the witness stand. He described the place where the alleged rape occurred as a small house made of wood with one room, and a floor area of around 10 x 12 meters. At that time, three families were occupying the house including the complainant's grandmother, aunt, uncle, and cousin. Considering the cramped space, the accused asserted that if anything happened within its confines, such as rape, it could be easily noticed by other persons in the room. He also declared that AAA, sometime in 1991, threatened to kill him because of his alleged womanizing.^[8]

Rulings of the RTC and the CA

On June 30, 2008, the RTC rendered its Decision finding the accused guilty of qualified rape, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, in light of the foregoing considerations, the prosecution having proved the guilt of the defendant BEN RUBIO y ACOSTA beyond reasonable doubt, he is hereby meted out the penalty of Reclusion Perpetua without eligibility of parole. Accused is likewise ordered to pay the victim the sum of Seventy Five Thousand Pesos (P75,000.00) as civil indemnity, Fifty Thousand Pesos (P50,000.00) as moral damages without necessity of proving the same. An amount of Twenty Five Thousand Pesos (P25,000.00) as exemplary damages is also in order to deter fathers with perverse behavior from sexually abusing their daughters.

The Warden of Nagpayong City Jail, Pasig City, Metro Manila is hereby directed to immediately transfer the defendant to the Bureau of Corrections, New Bilibid Prisons, Muntinlupa.

SO ORDERED.^[9]

Rubio filed an appeal with the CA, which affirmed *in toto* the decision of the RTC. The decretal portion of the July 26, 2010 Decision of the CA reads:

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing premises, the instant appeal is hereby ordered DISMISSED, and the appealed decision is AFFIRMED *in*

toto.^[10]

Hence, We have this appeal. The Office of the Solicitor General, for the People and by Manifestation and Motion, opted not to file a supplemental brief. Accused-appellant entered a similar manifestation. Thus, in resolving the instant appeal, We consider the issues and arguments he earlier raised in his Brief for the Accused-Appellant before the CA.

Accused-appellant raises the following issues for Our consideration:

I. THE COURT A *QUO* GRAVELY ERRED IN FINDING THE ACCUSED-APPELLANT GUILTY BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT OF THE CRIME CHARGED; AND

II. THE COURT A *QUO* GRAVELY ERRED IN REJECTING THE ACCUSED-APPELLANT'S DEFENSE.^[11]

Our Ruling

We uphold the ruling of the CA.

Guiding Principles in Rape Cases

In deciding rape cases, We are guided by these three well-entrenched principles:

(a) an accusation for rape is easy to make, difficult to prove and even more difficult to disprove; (b) in view of the intrinsic nature of the crime, the testimony of the complainant must be scrutinized with utmost caution; and (c) the evidence of the prosecution must stand on its own merits and cannot draw strength from the weakness of the evidence for the defense.^[12]

As a result of these guiding principles, the credibility of the victim becomes the single most important issue.^[13]

Core Issue: Credibility of the Victim-Complainant

When it comes to credibility, the trial court's assessment deserves great weight, and is even conclusive and binding, if not tainted with arbitrariness or oversight of some fact or circumstance of weight and influence.^[14] The reason is obvious. Having the full opportunity to observe directly the witnesses' deportment and manner of testifying, the trial court is in a better position than the appellate court to evaluate testimonial evidence properly.^[15] As this Court held in *People v. Gabrino*:

We have held time and again that "the trial court's assessment of the credibility of a witness is entitled to great weight, sometimes even with

finality.” As We have reiterated in the recent *People v. Combate*, where there is no showing that the trial court overlooked or misinterpreted some material facts or that it gravely abused its discretion, then We do not disturb and interfere with its assessment of the facts and the credibility of the witnesses. This is clearly because the judge in the trial court was the one who personally heard the accused and the witnesses, and observed their demeanor as well as the manner in which they testified during trial. Accordingly, the trial court, or more particularly, the RTC in this case, is in a better position to assess and weigh the evidence presented during trial.^[16]

Accused-appellant alleges that the testimony of the victim is replete with material inconsistencies and questions her credibility, to wit:

1. AAA first testified that she returned to their house on September 15, 1997^[17] but during cross-examination she stated that she returned to the house of her parents in 1999.^[18]
2. AAA alleged at one point that the accused-appellant had physically beaten her once prior to the sexual assault subject of the instant case^[19] but she then categorically stated that accused-appellant never laid a hand on her.^[20]
3. AAA at first alleged that there was a store in their house at the time of the rape,^[21] but later said it was already closed.^[22]

Although there are inconsistencies in AAA’s testimony, inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the rape victim’s testimony are to be expected.^[23] This Court finds that these inconsistencies are not material to the instant case. We held, “Rape victims are not expected to make an errorless recollection of the incident, so humiliating and painful that they might in fact be trying to obliterate it from their memory. Thus, a few inconsistent remarks in rape cases will not necessarily impair the testimony of the offended party.”^[24]

There is no showing that the trial court’s findings were tainted with arbitrariness or oversight; hence, the trial court’s finding as to the credibility of the victim is final and binding on this Court.

Furthermore, it bears stressing that testimonies of child victims are given full weight and credit, for youth and immaturity are badges of truth. In *People v. Perez*, the Court aptly held:

This Court has held time and again that testimonies of rape victims who are young and immature deserve full credence, considering that no young woman, especially of tender age, would concoct a story of defloration, allow an examination of her private parts, and thereafter pervert herself by being subject to a public trial, if she was not motivated

solely by the desire to obtain justice for the wrong committed against her. Youth and immaturity are generally badges of truth. It is highly improbable that a girl of tender years, one not yet exposed to the ways of the world, would impute to any man a crime so serious as rape if what she claims is not true.^[25]

Elements of Qualified Rape Duly Proved

The elements of rape as provided in the Revised Penal Code (RPC) are as follows:

ART. 266-A. Rape, When and How Committed. – Rape is committed –

1. By a man who **shall have carnal knowledge** of a woman under any of the following circumstances:
 - a. **Through force, threat or intimidation;**
 - b. When the offended party is deprived of reason or is otherwise unconscious;
 - c. By means of fraudulent machination or grave abuse of authority;
 - d. When the offended party is under twelve (12) years of age or is demented, even though none of the circumstances mentioned above be present. (Emphasis supplied.)

And one of the aggravating circumstances that would qualify the crime and raise the penalty to death is:

ART. 266-B. *Penalties* –

x x x x

The death penalty shall also be imposed if the crime of rape is committed with any of the following aggravating/qualifying circumstances:

- 1) When the victim is under eighteen (18) years of age and the offender is a parent, ascendant, step-parent, guardian, relative by consanguinity or affinity within the third civil degree, or the common law spouse of the parent of the victim. (Emphasis supplied.)

The testimony of the victim-complainant is as follows:

Q: On January 8, 2000 at about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, do you recall where you were?
A: Yes, Sir.