

## EN BANC

[ G.R. NO. 169077, August 31, 2006 ]

**THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS.  
NICANOR SALOME, ACCUSED-APPELLANT.**

### DECISION

**AZCUNA, J.:**

For review is the Decision rendered by the Court of Appeals on June 15, 2005 in CA-G.R. CR. No.-H.C. No. 00767, entitled "People of the Philippines v. Nicanor Salome," affirming the decision, dated April 3, 2001, of the Regional Trial Court of Virac, Catanduanes, Branch 43, in Criminal Case No. 2536, finding appellant guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of rape against thirteen-year old Sally Idanan, and imposing upon him the death penalty.

The antecedents are:

On February 18, 1998, upon the complaint of Sally Idanan, an information was filed against appellant under the name Canor Sabeniano. Appellant, however, filed a motion for reinvestigation on the ground that his name is Nicanor Salome and not Canor Sabeniano.

An amended information was filed on August 26, 1998 accusing CANOR SABENIANO also known as NICANOR SALOME, of the crime of RAPE defined and penalized under Article 335 of the revised Penal Code, as amended by Republic Act 7659, committed as follows:

That on or about or within the period comprised between July 1, 1997 to July 31, 1997 in the morning, in [B]arangay Lourdes, [M]unicipality of Pandan, [P]rovince of Catanduanes, Philippines, within the jurisdiction of the Honorable Court, the said accused, by means of force and intimidation, and with the use of a bladed weapon, willfully, unlawfully and feloniously, did lie and succeeded in having carnal knowledge of SALLY IDANAN, a minor who was then 13 years old at the time of the commission of the offense.

That the commission of the crime was aggravated by dwelling the fact that the crime was committed inside the house of the offended party.

CONTRARY TO LAW.<sup>[1]</sup>

Sally Idanan, fifteen years old, single, and a resident of Lourdes, Pandan, Catanduanes testified before the trial court that she personally knew appellant because they used to be neighbors. In 1997, they transferred residence but appellant would frequently pass by their place.<sup>[2]</sup>

Sometime in July of 1997, Sally, then thirteen years old, was sleeping with her three-year old brother inside their house when appellant entered their house. She was awakened by the presence of the latter who, allegedly, was poking a knife at the base of her neck. While holding the knife with one hand, appellant undressed her with his other hand. He threatened her that he would kill her and her family if she would tell anyone about the incident. After undressing her, appellant forced her to lie down. He removed his shorts and underwear. He then spread her legs and inserted his penis into her vagina.

According to Sally, she just closed her eyes while appellant had his way with her. She did not call for help because she was afraid that nobody would be in the next house which was about 800 meters away.<sup>[3]</sup>

She cannot remember how long appellant remained on top of her but before he left, he reiterated his threat to kill her and her family if she told anybody of what happened. After that, she would frequently see appellant but the latter never spoke to her.

Fearful for her life and for her family's safety, she did not inform anyone of the incident. Although it entered her mind that she could be pregnant, she left her province to work as a domestic helper in the house of SPO2 Constantino B. Saret in West Crame, San Juan, Manila.

On November 12, 1997, she had a pelvic ultrasound examination which confirmed her pregnancy.<sup>[4]</sup> Upon learning this, she reported the rape incident to the police on November 17, 1997. She executed a sworn statement and filed a complaint.

A criminal complaint for rape was initiated before the Municipal Circuit Trial Court (MCTC) of Pandan-Caramoran, Pandan, Catanduanes. Appellant pleaded not guilty to the charge during the arraignment.

Evidence for the prosecution consisted primarily of Sally's narration of the incident, and the testimony of Ma. Luz T. Santos, Medico Legal Officer of the Philippine National Police (PNP) Crime Laboratory, on the medico-legal report issued by Dr. Anthony Joselito Llamas<sup>[5]</sup> who examined Sally.

Ma. Luz T. Santos, while referring to the medical report, explained that the hymen has a deep healed laceration at 6:00 o'clock position but she cannot determine as to the time when it was inflicted. <sup>[6]</sup> Due to the fact that the vaginal canal was still narrow with prominent rugosities, Sally has not yet given birth although she was 18 to 19 weeks pregnant counting from the last day of her menstruation which was on July 5, 1997. On cross-examination, Santos declared that she was uncertain as to the exact date of sexual intercourse that caused the pregnancy of Sally, and that said act may have occurred days before or after July 5, 1997 on account of the fact that the life span of an average sperm cell lasts for three days.<sup>[7]</sup>

Evidence for the defense, on the other hand, consisted of the testimonies of appellant, Salvador Villarey and Manny Torralba.

Appellant denied having raped Sally and offered the defense of alibi. He claimed that

in the month of July 1997, he went fishing at the sea of Gigmoto, Catanduanes on three different days but could not exactly remember when. Villarey and Torralba corroborated the fact that they went fishing with appellant in July of 1997. They maintained, however, that while they had been appellant's fishing companions, they would go their separate ways after fishing and were not aware of appellant's activities after that.

On April 3, 2001, the trial court rendered its decision convicting appellant of the crime of rape and sentencing him as follows:

WHEREFORE, finding the accused Nicanor Salome also known as Canor Sabediano GUILTY beyond reasonable doubt of the crime of Rape with the use of a deadly weapon, committed inside the dwelling of the offended party, as defined and penalized under Article 335 of the Revised Penal Code, as amended by Republic Act No. 7659, he is hereby sentenced to suffer the penalty of DEATH, to give monthly support in the sum of Two Thousand (P2,000.00) Pesos to the offspring of complainant Sally Idanan born on April 11, 1998, and to indemnify Sally Idanan in the sum of Fifty Thousand (P50,000.00) Pesos, without subsidiary imprisonment in case of insolvency.

SO ORDERED.<sup>[8]</sup>

Due to the imposition of death penalty on appellant, the case was directly elevated to this Court for review. Subsequently, however, the case was referred to the Court of Appeals for intermediate review pursuant to our ruling in *People v. Mateo*.<sup>[9]</sup>

The Court of Appeals, after reviewing the case, rendered its Decision on June 15, 2005 affirming the conviction of appellant, with modifications:

WHEREFORE, the Decision dated April 3, 2001 of the trial court is affirmed subject to the following modifications:

- (1) The award of civil indemnity on the amount of P50,000.00 is increased to P75,000.00; and,
- (2) Appellant is ordered to pay private complainant moral damages of P75,000.00 and exemplary damages of P25,000.00.

Pursuant to A.M. No. 00-5-03-SC (Amendments to the Revised Rules of Criminal Procedure to govern Death Penalty Cases) which took into effect on October 15, 2004, this case is elevated and certified to the Supreme Court for its automatic review.

SO ORDERED.<sup>[10]</sup>

Appellant assigns the following errors:

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN GIVING WEIGHT AND CREDENCE TO THE UNCONVINCING AND IMPROBABLE TESTIMONY OF PRIVATE COMPLAINANT SALLY IDANAN; AND,

## II

THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN APPRECIATING DWELLING AS AN AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCE.

As a rule, the trial court's assessment of the credibility of witnesses is generally accorded the highest degree of weight and respect, if not finality, for the reason that the trial judge has the unique opportunity to observe the demeanor of witnesses while testifying.<sup>[11]</sup>

In giving credence to the Sally's testimony, the trial court noted that she did not have any improper motive against appellant other than her desire to tell the truth and obtain redress from the criminal act.<sup>[12]</sup>

In the commission of rape, it is usually only the rape victim who can attest to its occurrence,<sup>[13]</sup> and if the lone testimony of the victim is credible, convincing and consistent with human nature and the normal course of things, it is competent to establish the guilt of the accused.<sup>[14]</sup> This is even more so if it involves the testimony of a rape victim of tender or immature age such as in the instant case. Thus, if the victim is a young, immature girl, her testimony is given credence by the courts <sup>[15]</sup> because no one would contrive a rape story, allow an examination of her private parts and subject herself to scrutiny at a public trial if she is not motivated solely by a desire to have the culprit apprehended and punished.<sup>[16]</sup>

Appellant asserts that the conduct of private complainant during and after the commission of the offense militates against her credibility because it is inconsistent with human experience. She did not shout nor offer any resistance as expected of a woman being sexually abused. She likewise kept the incident to herself until she learned of her pregnancy three months later. Appellant further claims that there is no evidence that he threatened her or her family or that he prevented her from reporting the incident to anybody.<sup>[17]</sup>

The Court finds nothing incredible in Sally's behavior. She woke up with appellant poking a knife at the base of her neck. The act of holding a knife, by itself, is strongly suggestive of force or at least intimidation, and threatening the victim with a knife is sufficient to bring her to submission. The victim's failure to shout for help or resist the sexual advances of the rapist does not negate the commission of rape.<sup>[18]</sup> As noted by the trial court:

The fact that the accused did not shout or resist when her shorts and panty were removed because of fear (TSN, Oct. 21, 1999, p. 12) does not lessen complainant's credibility. To an innocent girl who was then barely thirteen (13) years old, the threat engendered in her a well-grounded fear that if she dared resist or frustrate the bestial desires of the accused, she and her family would be killed. Intimidation is addressed to the mind of the victim and is, therefore, subjective. It must

be viewed in the light of the victim's perception and judgment at the time of the commission of the crime and not by any hard and fast rule. The workings of the human mind when placed under emotional stress are unpredictable and people react differently. In such a given situation, some may shout; some may faint; and some may be shocked into sensibility; while others may openly welcome the intrusion. (*People v. Cabradilla*, 133 SCRA 413 (1984)). The test for its sufficiency under Article 335 of the revised Penal Code is whether it produces a reasonable fear in the victim that if she resists or does not yield to the bestial demands of the accused, that which the latter threatened to do would happen to her, or those dear to her, in this case, her family. Where such degree of intimidation exists, and the victim is cowed into submission as a result thereof, thereby rendering resistance futile, it would be extremely unreasonable to expect the victim to resist with all her might and strength. And even if some degree of resistance would nevertheless be futile, offering none at all cannot amount to consent to the sexual assault. For rape to exist, it is not necessary that the force or intimidation employed in accomplishing it be so great or of such character as could not be resisted; it is only necessary that the force or intimidation be sufficient to consummate the purpose which the accused had in mind. (*People v. Savellano*, 57 SCRA 320 (1974)).

Likewise, Sally's delay in reporting the incident to the authorities is understandable. It is not uncommon for young girls to conceal for some time the assault against their virtue because of the threats on their lives.<sup>[19]</sup> Failure, therefore, by the victim to file a complaint promptly to the proper authorities would not necessarily destroy the truth per se of the complaint nor would it impair the credibility of the complainant, particularly if such delay was satisfactorily explained.<sup>[20]</sup> As a matter of fact, delay in reporting a rape case due to threats is justified.<sup>[21]</sup> As the Court held in *People v. Ballester*:<sup>[22]</sup>

Neither can appellant find refuge in complainant's failure to promptly report the sexual assault to her relatives. Long silence and delay in reporting the crime of rape has not always been construed as an indication of a false accusation. In fact this principle applies with greater force in this case where the offended party was barely twelve years old, and was therefore susceptible to intimidation and threats of physical harm.

Not all rape victims can be expected to act conformably to the usual expectations of everyone. Different and varying degrees of behavioral responses is expected in the proximity of, or in confronting, an aberrant episode. It is settled that different people react differently to a given situation or type of situation and there is no standard form of human behavioral response when one is confronted with a strange, startling or frightful experience.<sup>[23]</sup>

Appellant further denies having raped Sally, asserting that he went fishing on three occasions in July of 1997. Denial, however, is inherently a weak defense and cannot prevail over the positive declarations of the victim.<sup>[24]</sup> For the defense of alibi and denial to prosper, appellant must prove by positive, clear and satisfactory proof that it was physically impossible for him to have been physically present at the scene of