

EN BANC

[G.R. No. 134096, March 03, 1999]

JOSEPH PETER S. SISON, PETITIONER, VS. COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS, RESPONDENTS.

D E C I S I O N

ROMERO, J.:

Before this Court is a petition for *certiorari* under Rule 65 of the Revised Rules of Court which impugns the Resolution^[1] of public respondent Commission on Elections (COMELEC) dated June 22, 1998 that dismissed petitioner Joseph Peter S. Sison's earlier petition^[2] in SPC No. 98-134, entitled "In the Matter of the Petition to Suspend the Canvassing of Votes and/or Proclamation in Quezon City and to Declare a Failure of Elections."

It appears that while the election returns were being canvassed by the Quezon City Board of Canvassers but before the winning candidates were proclaimed, petitioner commenced suit before the COMELEC by filing a petition seeking to suspend the canvassing of votes and/or proclamation in Quezon City and to declare a failure of elections. The said petition was supposedly filed pursuant to Section 6^[3] of the Omnibus Election Code (Batas Pambansa Blg. 881, as amended) on the ground of "massive and orchestrated fraud and acts analogous thereto which occurred after the voting and during the preparation of election returns and in the custody or canvass thereof, which resulted in a failure to elect."^[4]

In support of his allegation of massive and orchestrated fraud, petitioner cited specific instances which are summarized and set forth below:

1. The Board of Canvassers announced that election returns with no inner seal would be included in the canvass;
2. Board of Election Inspectors brought home copies of election returns meant for the City Board of Canvassers;
3. Petitioner, through counsel, raised written objections to the inclusion in the canvass of election returns which were either tampered with, altered or falsified, or otherwise not authentic;
4. According to the minutes of the City Board of Canvassers, there were precincts with missing election returns;
5. Several election returns with no data on the number of votes cast for vice mayoralty position;

6. Highly suspicious persons sneaking in some election returns and documents into the canvassing area;
7. Concerned citizen found minutes of the counting, keys, locks and metal seal in the COMELEC area for disposal as trash;
8. Board of Election Inspectors have volunteered information that they placed the copy of the election returns meant for the City Board of Canvassers in the ballot boxes deposited with the City Treasurer allegedly due to fatigue and lack of sleep;
9. Ballot boxes were never in the custody of the COMELEC and neither the parties nor their watchers were allowed to enter the restricted area where these boxes passed through on the way to the basement of the City Hall where they were supposedly kept; and
10. In the elections in Barangay New Era, there was a clear pattern of voting which would show that the election returns were manufactured and that no actual voting by duly qualified voters took place therein.

While the petition was pending before the COMELEC, the City Board of Canvassers proclaimed the winners of the elections in Quezon City, including the winning candidate for the post of vice mayor. On June 22, 1998, the COMELEC promulgated its challenged resolution dismissing the petition before it on the ground (1) that the allegations therein were not supported by sufficient evidence, and (2) that the grounds recited were not among the pre-proclamation issues set fourth in Section 17 of Republic Act No. 7166.^[5]

Hence, this petition.

Alleging that COMELEC overstepped the limits of reasonable exercise of discretion in dismissing SPC No. 98-134, petitioner argues in the main that the electoral body failed to afford him basic due process, that is, the right to a hearing and presentation of evidence before ruling on his petition. He then proceeded to argue that the election returns themselves, as well as the minutes of the canvassing committee of the City Board of Canvassers were, by themselves, sufficient evidence to support the petition.

Upon a meticulous study of the parties' arguments together with the pertinent statutory provisions and jurisprudence, this Court is of the opinion that there is no compelling reason why we should withhold our *imprimatur* from the questioned resolution.

At the outset, we notice that petitioner exhibits an ambivalent stand as to what exactly is the nature of the remedy he availed of at the time he initiated proceedings before the COMELEC in SPC No. 98-134. At the start, he anchors his initiatory petition under Section 6^[6] of the Omnibus Election Code regarding failure of elections but he later builds his case as a pre-proclamation controversy which is covered by Sections 241-248 of the Omnibus Election Code, as amended by R.A. No. 7166.^[7] In this respect, the rule is, what conjointly determine the nature of a

pleading are the allegations therein made in good faith, the stage of the proceeding at which it is filed, and the primary objective of the party filing the same.

In any case, petitioner nonetheless cannot succeed in either of the remedies he opted to pursue. Recently, in ***Matalam v. Commission on Elections***,^[8] we have already declared that a pre-proclamation controversy is not the same as an action for annulment of election results or declaration of failure of elections, founded as they are on different grounds.

Under the pertinent codal provision of the Omnibus Election Code, there are only three (3) instances where a failure of elections may be declared, namely: (a) the election in any polling place has not been held on the date fixed on account of *force majeure*, violence, terrorism, fraud, or other analogous causes; (b) the election in any polling place had been suspended before the hour fixed by law for the closing of the voting on account of *force majeure*, violence, terrorism, fraud, or other analogous causes; or (c) after the voting and during the preparation and transmission of the election returns or in the custody or canvass thereof, such election results in a failure to elect on account of *force majeure*, violence, terrorism, fraud, or other analogous causes.^[9] (Underscoring supplied) We have painstakingly examined petitioner's petition before the COMELEC but found nothing therein that could support an action for declaration of failure of elections. He never alleged at all that elections were either not held or suspended. Furthermore, petitioner's claim of failure to elect stood as a bare conclusion bereft of any substantive support to describe just exactly how the failure to elect came about.

With respect to pre-proclamation controversy, it is well to note that the scope of pre-proclamation controversy is only limited to the issues enumerated under Section 243^[10] of the Omnibus Election Code, and the enumeration therein is restrictive and exclusive.^[11] The reason underlying the delimitation both of substantive ground and procedure is the policy of the election law that pre-proclamation controversies should be summarily decided, consistent with the law's desire that the canvass and proclamation be delayed as little as possible.^[12] That is why such questions which require more deliberate and necessarily longer consideration, are left for examination in the corresponding election protest.^[13]

However, with the proclamation of the winning candidate for the position contested, the question of whether the petition raised issues proper for a pre-proclamation controversy is already of no consequence since the well-entrenched rule in such situation is that a pre-proclamation case before the COMELEC is no longer viable, the more appropriate remedies being a regular election protest or a petition for *quo warranto*.^[14] We have carefully reviewed all recognized exceptions^[15] to the foregoing rule but found nothing that could possibly apply to the instant case based on the recitations of the petition. What is more, in paragraph 3 of the COMELEC's Omnibus Resolution No. 3049 (Omnibus Resolution on Pending Cases) dated June 29, 1998, it is clearly stated therein that "All other pre-proclamation cases x x x shall be deemed terminated pursuant to Section 16, R. A. 7166."^[16] (Underscoring supplied). Section 16 which is referred to in the aforecited omnibus resolution refers to the termination of pre-proclamation cases when the term of the office involved has already begun, which is precisely what obtains here. We are, of course, aware that petitioner cites the said omnibus resolution in maintaining that his petition is