

## THIRD DIVISION

[ G.R. No. 187156, September 08, 2009 ]

**PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS.  
MELODY GUTIERREZ Y LAURIADA, ACCUSED-APPELLANT.**

### R E S O L U T I O N

**NACHURA, J.:**

Before this Court is an appeal by accused Melody Gutierrez y Lauriada of the Court of Appeals (CA) Decision<sup>[1]</sup> in CA-G.R. CR-H.C. No. 02884 affirming her conviction by the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Makati City<sup>[2]</sup> for violations of Republic Act No. 9165 (RA 9165), or the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002.

On January 25, 2007, a confidential informant known as Amboy went to the Anti-Illegal Drugs Special Operations Task Force (SAID-SOTF) of the Makati Police Station, and reported that accused and another, known by his alias Toto, were selling illegal drugs on Adora Street, Barangay Tejeros, Makati City. Police Officer 1 (PO1) Jaime Orante, Jr., who interviewed the informant, checked the Makati Drug Abuse Council (MADAC) watch list, and found accused's name in it. A team composed of SAID-SOTF and MADAC operatives was quickly formed to conduct a buy-bust operation. PO1 Orante was designated as poseur-buyer and given three marked one-hundred peso bills.<sup>[3]</sup>

At 6:30 that evening, the team and informant Amboy proceeded to Adora Street. PO1 Orante and Amboy approached accused. Amboy greeted accused and said, "*Te, mayroon ba tayo dyan tatlo lang?*" PO1 Orante handed accused the marked money, and the latter placed the money in her pocket. Accused then took a plastic container and a plastic sachet containing a white crystalline substance and handed these to PO1 Orante. The latter then reversed the bull cap he was wearing as a signal that the transaction had been completed. The rest of the team came forward and helped PO1 Orante arrest accused. The plastic sachets confiscated from accused were brought to the Philippine National Police (PNP) Crime Laboratory for examination. It was found that the contents thereof were methylamphetamine hydrochloride, more commonly known as shabu, a prohibited drug.<sup>[4]</sup>

Accused Melody Gutierrez was charged for violation of Article II, Sections 5 and 11 of RA 9165 before the Makati City RTC for, first, selling P300.00 worth of methylamphetamine hydrochloride weighing 0.02 gram;<sup>[5]</sup> and second, for possession, custody and control of three plastic sachets of methylamphetamine hydrochloride weighing 0.02 gram each.<sup>[6]</sup>

At the trial, accused denied the charges against her. She claimed that on the day she was arrested, she was having a snack on Barona Street when a green-colored vehicle stopped near her. Two men alighted from the vehicle, introduced themselves

as police officers, and asked her if she knew the whereabouts of a certain Toto. She said she did not know the person they were looking for, but the two men did not believe her. They forced her into the vehicle and brought her to SAID-SOTF.<sup>[7]</sup>

In a Decision<sup>[8]</sup> dated May 25, 2007, the trial court held that the prosecution was able to prove the elements of the illegal sale of shabu, on one hand, and the illegal possession of a dangerous drug on the other. Thus, it found the accused guilty of the offenses charged, to wit:

**WHEREFORE**, it appearing that the guilt of accused MELODY GUTIERREZ y LAURIADA was proven beyond reasonable doubt, for the offenses of violation of Sections 5 and 11, Article II of RA 9165, as principal, with no mitigating or aggravating circumstances, she is hereby sentenced:

1. In Criminal Case No. 07-286, to suffer life imprisonment and to pay a fine of P500,000.00;
2. In Criminal Case No. 07-287, to suffer imprisonment for an indeterminate term of fourteen <sup>[14]</sup> years eight <sup>[8]</sup> months and one <sup>[1]</sup> day, as minimum, and to pay a fine of P300,000.00; and
3. To pay the costs.

Let the 0.02-gram, 0.02-gram, 0.02-gram, and 0.02 gram; (sic) of Methylamphetamine Hydrochloride be turned-over (sic) to the PDEA for proper disposition.

**SO ORDERED.**

Accused appealed her conviction to the Court of Appeals. She argued that her guilt was not proven, because nobody corroborated the testimony of PO1 Orante; and the other prosecution witness, MADAC Operative Joebert Dela Peña, admitted that his sole participation was in assisting in the arrest of the accused. Accused also questioned the failure of the prosecution to present the confidential informant as witness, and the forensic chemist to testify the veracity of the laboratory report. Accused claimed that the sole eyewitness testimony of PO1 Orante to the sale was insufficient to prove her guilt beyond reasonable doubt.<sup>[9]</sup>

The CA affirmed the RTC Decision *in toto* in a Decision dated September 30, 2008.<sup>[10]</sup> It held that what is material is proof that the transaction took place, coupled with the presentation in court of the *corpus delicti* as evidence, both of which were proven by the testimony of PO1 Orante. Contrary to accused's contention, the consummation of the sale was corroborated by MADAC Operative Dela Peña.<sup>[11]</sup>

As to the failure of the prosecution to present the forensic chemist who examined the content of the plastic sachets seized from accused, the CA said this does not diminish the integrity of the testimonies of the other prosecution witnesses. According to the CA, the witnesses were able to prove the chain of custody from the