376 Phil. 191

SECOND DIVISION

[G.R. No. 123045, November 16, 1999]

DEMETRIO R. TECSON, PETITIONER, VS. SANDIGANBAYAN AND PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES, RESPONDENTS.

DECISION

QUISUMBING, J.:

This petition for review on certiorari, under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court, seeks to nullify the Decision dated June 30, 1995 and the Resolution dated December 20, 1995 of the Sandiganbayan, First Division, in Criminal Case No. 18273. Petitioner was found guilty of violating Section 3[c] of R.A. No. 3019, in the assailed decision which reads as follows:

> `WHEREFORE, the Court finds Demetrio Tecson y Robles guilty beyond reasonable doubt of the crime defined in Section 3[c] of Republic Act 3019 and charged in the Information. Accordingly, the Court imposes upon him the penalty of imprisonment of SIX (6) YEARS and ONE (1) MONTH, and perpetual disqualification from public office. No civil indemnity is awarded for the reason that Tecson and Mrs. Salvacion D. Luzana entered into a compromise agreement waiving his/her claims against the other.
>
> "So Ordered."[1]

Petitioner was, at the time of the commission of the offense charged in the Information, the Municipal Mayor of Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur.

Private complainant before the Sandiganbayan, Mrs. Salvacion Luzana, is a resident of Poblacion, Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur. She is a neighbor of the petitioner. She claims to be a housewife who occasionally dabbles in farming.[2]

The antecedent facts, which gave rise to the instant case, were synthesized by the Sandiganbayan as follows:

> "In the last week of September 1989, upon the offer of Tecson, he and Mrs. Luzana agreed to engage in an investment business. They would sell tickets at P100.00 each which after 30 days would earn P200.00 or more. She would buy appliances and cosmetics at a discount, with the use of the proceeds of the sales of tickets, and resell them. No other details were disclosed on how the business would operate, and Tecson does not appear to have contributed any monetary consideration to the capital. On September 27, 1989, they began selling tickets.
>
> "Tecson also acted as agent selling tickets. He got on that day early in the morning two booklets of tickets, for which he signed the covers of the

booklets to acknowledge receipt. Before noon of the same day he returned after having already sold 40 tickets in the amount of P4,000.00, bringing with him a Mayor's Permit in the name of Mrs. Luzana for their business called `LD Assurance Privileges.' He asked for a cash advance of P4,000.00 which he would use during the fiesta on September 29, 1989, and he would not release the Mayor's Permit unless the cash advance was given him. Mrs. Luzana reluctantly acceded, saying that it was not the due date yet, so he was getting the cash advances on his share. Tecson signed for the cash advance.

"On October 3, 1989, Mrs. Luzana secured a Business Permit in accordance with the instructions of Tecson. The permit was in her name but the same was for the operation of `Prosperidad Investment and Sub-Dealership,' the new name of the business. In the session of the Sangguniang Bayan of Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur on October 17, 1989 presided over by Tecson, Resolution No. 100 was passed revoking the business permit at the instance of the Provincial Director of the Department of Trade and Industry."[3]

With the revocation of her business permit, private complainant below filed an administrative case against petitioner, for violation of Section 3 [c], R.A. No. 3019 and Section 60 of B.P. Blg. 337 (then Local Government Code) with the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG). The complaint was docketed as Adm. Case No. SP-90-01 and referred to the Sangguniang Panlalawigan of Agusan del Sur for appropriate action.

Not content with having instituted administrative proceedings, private complainant below also filed a civil case against petitioner for damages with the Regional Trial Court, Branch 6, of Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur. This action was docketed as Civil Case No. 716.

A complaint was likewise filed with the Ombudsman for violation of R.A. No. 3019, otherwise known as the "Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act." This complaint was docketed as OMB Case No. 3-8-02919. It was subsequently referred to the Sandiganbayan, which took jurisdiction. The Information filed on October 28, 1992 reads:

"That on or about September 23, 1989, in the Municipality of Prosperidad, Province of Agusan del Sur, Philippines, and within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court, the above-named accused, a public officer, being then the Municipal Mayor of Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur, while in the performance of his administrative and official functions and committing the offense in relation to his office, did then and there willfully, unlawfully, and criminally request and receive for his benefit the amount of P4,000.00, for and in consideration of the issuance of a permit to operate an investment business, in favor of one Salvacion Luzana, a person for whom the accused has in fact received and obtained a mayor's permit or license.

"Contrary to law."[4]

On July 29, 1991, the Sangguniang Panlalawigan of Agusan del Sur dismissed the administrative case.

On October 28, 1991, a compromise agreement was reached between the litigants in Civil Case No. 716. The trial court approved the same on December 6, 1991.

On November 3, 1992, the Sandiganbayan issued an order for petitioner's arrest. He was immediately apprehended, but after posting a property bond on December 2, 1992, was released on provisional liberty.

On February 23, 1993, Tecson was arraigned with the assistance of counsel *de parte.* He entered a plea of "not guilty." Trial then proceeded on the merits.

On June 30, 1995, the Sandiganbayan, First Division rendered the assailed decision convicting appellant of violating R.A. No. 3019. Petitioner seasonably filed a motion for reconsideration. The respondent court denied the same in its resolution dated December 20, 1995.

Hence, this instant petition. Petitioner contends that:

> "THE RESPONDENT COURT/SANDIGANBAYAN (1st DIVISION) GRAVELY ABUSED ITS DISCRETION, TANTAMOUNT TO LACK OF OR IN EXCESS OF JURISDICTION --
>
> A- IN RULING UNREASONABLY THAT THE GUILT OF THE ACCUSED HAD BEEN PROVEN BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT DESPITE THE CLEAR AND CONVINCING TESTIMONY OF THE NBI EXPERT SHOWING THAT THE DOCUMENTS PRESENTED BY COMPLAINANTS AND SUBJECTED FOR EXAMINATION BY NBI ARE DIFFERENT FROM THE HANDWRITING OF THE ACCUSED, AND THEREFORE FABRICATED.
>
> B- IN PROCEEDING WITH THE TRIAL AND CONVICTION DESPITE THE EXISTENCE OF JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL RENDERED BY THE SANGGUNIANG PANLALAWIGAN EXONERATING THE ACCUSED.
>
> C- IN IGNORING THE DOCTRINE OF *RES JUDICATA* AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS OF DOUBLE JEOPARDY."[5]

Otherwise stated, the issues are:

> (1) Whether or not the decision of the Sangguniang Panlalawigan exonerating the accused serves as a bar by prior judgment to the decision of the Sandiganbayan;
>
> (2) Whether or not there was a violation of the Constitutional right of the accused against double jeopardy; and
>
> (3) Whether or not the guilt of the petitioner was proven beyond reasonable doubt.

The issues shall be discussed *in seriatim*.

Anent the *first issue*, petitioner contends that the dismissal of the administrative case before the Sangguniang Panlalawigan of Agusan del Sur is conclusive and binding upon the parties. Relying on our ruling *in B.F. Goodrich Philippines, Inc. v. Workmen's Compensation Commission*,[6] he theorizes that the rule, which prohibits the reopening of matters already determined by competent judicial authority, applies to quasi-judicial bodies or administrative offices. Having been exonerated by the Sangguniang Panlalawigan of Agusan del Sur in the administrative case, he now submits the same is *res judicata* and thus bars the Sandiganbayan from hearing his case.

Petitioner's theory has no leg to stand on. First, it must be pointed out that *res judicata* is a doctrine of civil law.[7] It thus has no bearing in the criminal proceedings before the Sandiganbayan. Second, it is a basic principle of the law on public officers that a public official or employee is under a three-fold responsibility for violation of duty or for a wrongful act or omission. This simply means that a public officer may be held civilly, criminally, and administratively liable for a wrongful doing. Thus, if such violation or wrongful act results in damages to an individual, the public officer may be held *civilly* liable to reimburse the injured party. If the law violated attaches a penal sanction, the erring officer may be punished *criminally.* Finally, such violation may also lead to suspension, removal from office, or other *administrative* sanctions. This administrative liability is separate and distinct from the penal and civil liabilities. Thus, the dismissal of an administrative case does not necessarily bar the filing of a criminal prosecution for the same or similar acts, which were the subject of the administrative complaint.[8] We conclude, therefore, that the decision of the Sangguniang Panlalawigan of Agusan del Sur exonerating petitioner in Administrative Case No. SP 90-01 is no bar to the criminal prosecution before the Sandiganbayan.

As to the amicable settlement in Civil Case No. 716 with the Regional Trial Court, Branch 6, of Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur, it is settled that a complaint for misconduct, malfeasance or misfeasance against a public officer or employee cannot just be withdrawn at any time by the complainant. This is because there is a need to maintain the faith and confidence of the people in the government and its agencies and instrumentalities.[9] The inescapable conclusion, therefore, is that the order of the trial court dismissing Civil Case No. 716 did not bar the proceedings before the Sandiganbayan.

Regarding the *second issue,* petitioner contends that being tried before the Sandiganbayan violated his constitutional protection against double jeopardy since the Sangguniang Panlalawigan of Agusan del Sur had already cleared him of all charges.

Article III, Section 21 of the Constitution provides:

> "No person shall be twice put in jeopardy of punishment for the same offense. If an act is punished by a law and an ordinance, conviction or acquittal under either shall constitute a bar to another prosecution for the same act."

Double jeopardy attaches only: (1) upon a valid indictment; (2) before a competent court; (3) after arraignment; (4) when a valid plea has been entered; and (5) when the defendant was acquitted or convicted or the case was dismissed or otherwise