



Republic of the Philippines
House of Representatives Electoral Tribunal
Electoral Tribunal Building
Commonwealth Avenue, Quezon City

**WIGBERTO "TOBY" R.
TAÑADA, JR.,**

Protestant,

- versus -

**HRET Case No. 13-018 (EP)
Fourth District, Quezon**

**ANGELINA "HELEN" D.
TAN,**

Protestee.

Promulgated: **SEP 25 2014**

X-----X

RESOLUTION

Bersamin, J.:

To be resolved are the special and affirmative defenses raised by the protestee in her verified answer to the election protest. The defenses are, namely: (a) the protestant engaged in forum-shopping; (b) the election protest was insufficient in form and substance; and (c) the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to declare Alvin John Tañada as a nuisance candidate.

Antecedents

Culled from the records and the submissions of the parties herein, as well as from the ruling of the Supreme Court in *Tañada, Jr. v. Commission on Elections, et al.*,¹ are the factual antecedents relevant to this resolution.

For the position of Representative of the Fourth Legislative District of the Province of Quezon contested in the National and Local Elections of 2013, three candidates filed their respective Certificates of Candidacy (CoC), namely: Wigberto R. Tañada, Jr. (Wigberto) of the Liberal Party;

¹ G.R. No. 207199-200, October 22, 2013, 708 SCRA 188.

Angelina D. Tan (Tan) of the Nationalist People's Coalition; and Alvin John S. Tañada (Alvin John) of the Lapiang Manggagawa. In October 2012, Wigberto filed twin petitions in the Commission on Elections (COMELEC) to seek the cancellation of Alvin John's CoC (docketed as SPA No. 13-056), and to declare Alvin John a nuisance candidate (docketed as SPA No. 13-057). The petitions were eventually consolidated.

On January 29, 2013, the COMELEC First Division dismissed the consolidated petitions for their lack of merit.

Wigberto duly filed his motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of his petitioners, alleging the following grounds, to wit:

- a) Assuming Respondent Tañada resided in Purok 3, Barangay Progreso, Gumaca, Quezon for a period of thirteen (13) years, the said period was long ago. Presently, Respondent Tañada failed to comply with the one-year residency requirement.
- b) Respondent Tañada was a resident of Parañaque where he was enrolled as a voter from 2009 until 4 June 2012, when he transferred his Voter's Registration to Gumaca, Quezon; and
- c) Respondent Tañada's own tweets and entries in Facebook are bereft of any political plans or activities which betray his true intentions to run as Member of the 4th District of Gumaca, Quezon.²

On April 25, 2013, the COMELEC *En Banc* denied Wigberto's motion for reconsideration in SPA No. 13-057, but granted his motion for reconsideration in SPA No. 13-056, decreeing thusly:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the Motion for Reconsideration dated 18 February 2013 is PARTIALLY GRANTED. The Motion for Reconsideration for SPA No. 13-057 (DC) is DENIED for LACK OF MERIT. However, the Motion for Reconsideration for SPA No. 13-056 (DC) is GRANTED. Accordingly, Respondent Alvin John S. Tañada's Certificate of Candidacy for the position of Member of the House of Representatives for the 4th District of the Province of Quezon is hereby CANCELLED.³

On May 7, 2013, Wigberto sought the reconsideration of the denial of his petition in SPA Case No. 13-057 to urge the declaration of Alvin John as a nuisance candidate on the basis of newly discovered evidence.

² COMELEC En Banc Resolution dated April 25, 2013 in SPA No. 13-056 and SPA No. 13-057, p. 7.

³ *Id.* at 15.

For the May 13, 2013 National and Local Elections, the name of candidate Alvin John remained in the ballots. After the canvass of the votes, the following results indicated that Tan was the winning candidate, to wit:

Tan	84,782
Tañada, Wigberto	80,698
Tañada, Alvin John	7,038

On May 16, 2013, Wigberto filed with the Quezon Provincial Board of Canvassers (Quezon PBOC) his PETITION TO CORRECT MANIFEST ERRORS IN THE CERTIFICATES OF CANVASS FOR THE POSITION OF MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 4TH DISTRICT QUEZON with URGENT MOTION TO SUSPEND CANVASS AND/OR PROCLAMATION FOR THE SAID POSITION, whereby he prayed that the COMELEC direct the Quezon PBOC to consolidate in his favor the votes canvassed for Alvin John, and to proclaim the candidate with the highest number of votes as the winner.

The Quezon PBOC denied Wigberto's motion to have the votes garnered by Alvin John credited in his favor on the same date of May 16, 2013, holding that the votes of Alvin John could not be counted in favor of Wigberto because the cancellation of the former's CoC had been on the basis of his material misrepresentations under Section 78 of the *Omnibus Election Code*, not on being a nuisance candidate under Section 69 of the *Omnibus Election Code*. The Quezon PBOC then proclaimed Tan as the winning candidate.

On May 21, 2013, Wigberto filed a SUPPLEMENT TO THE PETITION WITH ADDITIONAL PRAYER FOR ANNULMENT OF PROCLAMATION, whereby he reiterated his prayer to be declared as the winning candidate for the position of Representative of the Fourth District of Quezon by consolidating the votes received by Alvin John with the votes he garnered.

On May 27, 2013, Wigberto brought in the Supreme Court his *AD CAUTELAM* PETITION FOR *CERTIORARI*, *MANDAMUS* AND *PROHIBITION* with URGENT MOTION FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A *STATUS QUO ANTE* ORDER to assail the COMELEC *En Banc*'s Resolution promulgated on April 25, 2013 declaring Alvin John not a nuisance candidate, docketed as G.R. Nos. 207199-200, thereby imploring the Supreme Court to declare Alvin John as a nuisance candidate, and to order the COMELEC to credit the votes received by Alvin John in his favor.

On May 30, 2013, Wigberto filed in this Tribunal this election protest *ad cautela*, pertinently alleging as follows:

13. The fraud perpetrated upon herein Protestant in the fielding of Alvin John Tañada as a nuisance candidate consists of the following:

- a. The lawyers who turned out to be counsels for Protestee collaborated, in varying degrees and at various times, in support of the nuisance candidate Alvin John Tañada, in a case of an otherwise patent conflict of interest, unless their client Protestee in the first place was precisely the sponsor of the candidacy of Alvin John as a nuisance candidate in order to confuse and mislead the voters into voting for Alvin John instead of herein Protestant, to wit: xxx
- b. As found by the Comelec En Banc in SPA 13-056, Alvin John Tañada "is not a resident of and/or never resided" in the Fourth District of Quezon, and that he had the "intent to mislead, misinform, or deceive the electorate" since he is a resident of Paranaque City, and therefore disqualified from running for any elective post in the Fourth District of Quezon. xxx
- d. Alvin John Tañada was never seen campaigning in the Fourth District of Quezon Province, nor did he have any posters in the common poster areas. Neither did he attend any campaign rally or candidate's forum. To top it all, he did not even bother to vote in the May 13, 2013 Elections.
- e. An avid user of social media such as Facebook and Twitter, Alvin John Tañada never made a single post or tweet to his friends, relatives or associates in said media about his political plans of the fact that he was running for Congressman. Such palpable silence, if not secrecy, on one's candidacy is a trademark attitude of nuisance candidates. They make themselves publicly scarce and difficult to track down, when the very nature of a candidacy precisely seeks nourishment from widespread publicity and maximum exposure.
- f. The fraudulent fielding of Alvin John Tañada as a nuisance candidate resulted in 7,038 votes for the one and only bona fide candidate with the surname "Tañada", Wigberto "Toby" Tañada, whose certificate of candidacy, in the first place, had already been ordered cancelled by the Comelec in its April 25, 2013 consolidated Resolution in SPA 13-056 and 13-057. xxx

22. Because of the perpetration of fraud upon herein Protestant through the malicious and intentional fielding of a nuisance candidate in the person of Alvin John Tañada to sabotage the candidacy of herein Protestant, and the inclusion of Alvin John's name in the ballot despite the cancellation of his certificate of candidacy, Protestant is hereby protesting the miscounting and mistabulation of the votes cast for him as votes for

Alvin John in the ten (10) Municipal Board of Canvassers of the Fourth District of Quezon and the Provincial Board of Canvassers of Quezon, as follows: xxx

Meanwhile, on June 28, 2013, the COMELEC Second Division favorably acted on the motion to annul the proclamation of Tan, and annulled the proclamation, and directed the Quezon PBOC to credit the 7,038 votes of Alvin John to Wigberto, and to declare the winner after the re-computation of the votes. While Wigberto's petition for *certiorari* was still pending in the Supreme Court, the COMELEC *En Banc* affirmed the action of the COMELEC Second Division annulling Tan's proclamation. However, Tan had by then taken her oath and assumed office past noon time of June 30, 2013, thereby rendering the adverse resolution on her proclamation moot.

On October 22, 2013, the Supreme Court promulgated its resolution in G.R. No. 207199-200 dismissing Wigberto's *AD CAUTELAM* PETITION FOR *CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS* AND PROHIBITION With URGENT MOTION FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A *STATUS QUO ANTE* ORDER, *viz:*

Case law states that the proclamation of a congressional candidate following the election divests the COMELEC of jurisdiction over disputes relating to the election, returns, and qualifications of the proclaimed representative in favor of the HRET. The phrase "election, returns and qualifications" refers to all matters affecting the validity of the contestee's title. In particular, the term "election" refers to the conduct of the polls, including the listing of voters, the holding of the electoral campaign, and the casting and counting of the votes; "returns" refers to the canvass of the returns and the proclamation of the winners, including questions concerning the composition of the board of canvassers and the authenticity of the election returns; and "qualifications" refers to matters that could be raised in a *quo warranto* proceeding against the proclaimed winner, such as his disloyalty or ineligibility or the inadequacy of his COC.

In the foregoing light, considering that Angelina had already been proclaimed as Member of the House of Representatives for the 4th District of Quezon Province on May 16, 2013, as she has in fact taken her oath and assumed office past noon time of June 30, 2013, the Court is now without jurisdiction to resolve the case at bar. As they stand, the issues concerning the conduct of the canvass and the resulting proclamation of Angelina as herein discussed are matters which fall under the scope of the terms "election" and "returns" as above-stated and hence, properly fall under the HRET's sole jurisdiction.

WHEREFORE, the petition is **DISMISSED**.

SO ORDERED.⁴

Thereafter, the Tribunal directed Tan to submit her responsive pleading to the election contest.

In compliance, Tan filed her verified answer with special and affirmative defenses and counter-protest, praying that the Tribunal dismiss the election protest pursuant to Rule 16 in relation to Rule 21 of *The 2011 Rules of the House of Representatives Electoral Tribunal* (2011 HRET Rules) for being grossly deficient in form and substance under the law, and considering further that Wigberto was guilty of forum shopping.

In his reply and answer to the counter-protest, Wigberto insisted that the Supreme Court had already declared in G.R. No. 207199-200 that the Tribunal had exclusive jurisdiction to determine whether or not Alvin John was a nuisance candidate, and whether or not crediting the votes garnered by Alvin John to Wigberto constituted an election contest.

On February 11, 2014, Tan filed her comment with motion to dismiss and/or to set the case for preliminary hearing or oral argument.

On February 27, 2014, the Tribunal granted Tan's motion to set the oral arguments, and held oral arguments on March 13, 2014.

Ruling of the Tribunal

The Tribunal **HOLDS** that Wigberto did not commit forum shopping, but **RULES** that: (a) Wigberto's election protest was insufficient in form and substance; and (b) it has no jurisdiction to declare in these proceedings that Alvin John was a nuisance candidate.

I.**Wigberto was not guilty of forum-shopping**

Tan interposes that Wigberto committed forum shopping as to warrant the immediate dismissal of this election protest.

The interposition is unfounded.

⁴ *Supra*, note 1, at 195-196.

Forum shopping is the act of a party against whom an adverse judgment has been rendered in one forum of seeking and possibly getting a favorable ruling in another forum, other than by appeal or the special civil action of *certiorari*; it is also the institution of two or more actions or proceedings grounded on the same cause on the supposition that one or the other court would make a favorable disposition.⁵ For it to exist, therefore, both actions must involve the same transaction, same essential facts, and same circumstances, and must raise identical causes of action, subject matter and issues.⁶ Clearly, it does not exist where different orders were questioned, two distinct causes of action and issues were raised, or two objectives were sought.⁷

Under the 2011 HRET Rules, there is no specific provision defining or sanctioning forum shopping. However, Rule 76 of the 2011 HRET Rules allows the application by analogy or in a suppletory character of the *Rules of Court*, decisions of the Supreme Court and decisions of the Electoral Tribunals unless they were inconsistent with the 2011 HRET Rules, or with the orders, resolutions and decisions of the Tribunal itself.

Based on the relevant rules and jurisprudence, the moves adopted by Wigberto did not constitute forum shopping. It is most notable that he brought his election protest to the Tribunal in the belief that it was here where he could obtain the proper relief from his electoral predicament. The situation confronting him then was unlike other disputes cognizable by the regular courts, where the rule against forum shopping has been most rigorously applied in order to prevent the unscrupulous litigants from looking for a friendly forum in order to obtain a favorable result, thereby not only clogging the overburdened court dockets but also obstructing the essence of court litigation as the process to end or resolve disputes. But there is no similarity between his situation then and those where the rule against forum shopping has been most rigorously applied. This has been a legitimate quest for him to compel the ascertainment and determination of the will of the sovereign constituents in the Fourth Legislative District of the Province of Quezon. The Constitution and the prevailing election laws and regulations mandated the quest to continue here because the contested position involved the Membership in the Lower House of Congress. With his announced objective being to contest the electoral victory of Tan, or to assail her qualifications for the position of Representative of his Legislative District, his coming to the Tribunal was exclusive. Indeed, forum shopping was not an issue when the forum was exclusive.

⁵ *Roxas v. Court of Appeals*, 363 SCRA 207.

⁶ *Veluz v. Court of Appeals*, 345 SCRA 756; *International School, Inc. v. Court of Appeals*, 309 SCRA 474.

⁷ *Yulienco v. Court of Appeals*, 308 SCRA 206.

2.**The election protest of Wigberto was insufficient in form and substance**

Rule 16 of the 2011 HRET Rules provides:

Rule 16. Election Protest.- A verified petition contesting the election or returns of any Member of the House of Representatives shall be filed by any candidate who has duly filed a certificate of candidacy and has been voted for the same office, within fifteen (15) days after the proclamation of the winner. The party filing the protest shall be designated as the protestant while the adverse party shall be known as the protestee.

xxx

An election protest shall state:

1. The date of proclamation of the winner and the number of votes obtained by the parties per proclamation;
2. The total number of contested individual and clustered precincts per municipality or city;
3. The individual and clustered precinct numbers and location of the contested precincts; and
4. The specific acts or omissions complained of constituting the electoral frauds, anomalies or irregularities in the contested precincts.

Pursuant to Rule 16, *supra*, there was a necessity for Wigberto as the protestant to identify the individual precincts that he wanted to contest the results of, and to specify the acts or omissions complained of constituting the electoral frauds, anomalies or irregularities in the contested precincts. It is obvious that the identification of the precincts and the specification of the electoral frauds, anomalies or irregularities in the contested precincts would determine the substance of the cause of action in the election protest. Such averments were jurisdictional because the election protest would warrant or call for the reopening of the ballot boxes in order to ascertain and determine whether the votes of the sovereign voters were accurately counted by the PCOS machines.

In *Villafuerte v. Arroyo*,⁸ the Tribunal dismissed the election protest for failure of the protestant to aver all the jurisdictional allegations required by Rule 16, *supra*, observing thusly:

⁸ Docketed as 13-020 (EP), promulgated on November 28, 2013.

In sum, the protest is insufficient in form and substance considering **that it does not contain a statement as to the specific and total number of contested individual and clustered precincts per municipality and the individual and clustered precinct numbers and location of the contested precincts**, thus effectively failing to state a cause of action.

Sadly, Wigberto's election protest did not contain the ultimate facts to support a valid election protest in the context of Rule 16, *supra*. His pleading, albeit captioned as an election protest, was more of a petition to annul the proclamation of Tan instead of a protest to contest the conduct and returns of the election. He simply rehashed therein whatever he had asked the COMELEC to do but did not obtain. He did not thereby seek the opening of the ballots to enable the revision of the votes, the essential objective of every genuine election protest. As such, his election protest could not prosper from the start, for in this jurisdiction it is not the caption but the allegations of the ultimate facts in the initiatory pleading that give meaning to the pleading and furnish the basis by which such pleading can be legally characterized.⁹

Wigberto contended that the fraud committed by Tan consisted in her supposed fielding of Alvin John as a nuisance candidate intended to confuse the voters between Alvin John and Wigberto. In his election protest, however, Wigberto did not mention of any fraud in the context of a misread ballot that should have been counted in his favor, or of already pre-shaded ballots being received by his supporters. In short, the fraud that was material in an election protest must be of intrinsic nature as to which the protestant was caught off his guard. Instead, the purported fraud committed against Wigberto was of the extrinsic type, and was patently one that he could have effectively prevented after the filing of Alvin John's CoC but still during the campaign period. Wigberto could have also thwarted such extrinsic fraud by intensive voter education prior to the holding of elections, as well as by convincing the COMELEC to declare Alvin John as a nuisance candidate. Having failed to prevent such fraud, Wigberto cannot now be permitted to improperly use the vehicle of an election protest to enable him to obtain relief.

3.
The Tribunal has no jurisdiction
over the issue of whether or not Alvin John
was a nuisance candidate

⁹ *Republic v. Nolasco*, G.R. No. 155108, 27 April 2005, 457 SCRA 400.

Section 17, Article VI of the 1987 Constitution defines the jurisdiction of the HRET in the following terms, to wit:

Section 17. The Senate and the House of Representatives shall each have an Electoral Tribunal, which shall be the sole judge of all contests relating to the **election, returns, and qualifications of their respective Members**. Each Election Tribunal shall be composed of nine Members, three of whom shall be Justices of the Supreme Court to be designated by the Chief Justice, and the remaining six shall be Members of the Senate or House of Representatives, as the case may be, who shall be chosen on the basis of proportional representation from the political parties and the parties or organizations registered under the party-list system represented therein. The senior Justice in the Electoral Tribunal shall be its Chairman.

It is without question, therefore, that the power to judge the qualifications of the **Members of the House of Representatives** is solely vested in the Tribunal.

But may the qualifications of a person like Alvin John be competently inquired into and determined by the Tribunal considering that he was *not* a Member of the House of Representatives? Does the Tribunal have the jurisdiction to deal with and decide whether or not Alvin John was a nuisance candidate?

The answers to these decisive queries were provided in *Aggabao v. Commisison on Elections*,¹⁰ as follows:

The HRET has sole and exclusive jurisdiction over all contests relative to the election, returns, and qualifications of members of the House of Representatives. Thus, once a winning candidate **has been proclaimed, taken his oath, and assumed office as a Member** of the House of Representatives, COMELEC's jurisdiction over election contests relating to his election, returns, and qualifications ends, and the HRET's own jurisdiction begins.

It is true that the use of the word 'sole' emphasizes the exclusive character of the jurisdiction of the HRET to the point that it can be seen as such is complete and unimpaired. In fact the findings of this Tribunal with regard to matters within its jurisdiction is given much respect even finality by the Supreme Court. However, even with an expanded jurisdiction such is also limited. Matters like the determination whether a candidate is a nuisance candidate is not within the jurisdiction of this Tribunal. For if this

¹⁰ G.R. No. 163756. January 26, 2005, 449 SCRA 400, 404-405. citing *Guerrero v. Commission on Elections*, 391 Phil. 344, 352.

Tribunal was to look into the qualifications of a candidate it would be committing grave abuse of discretion. This is because the provision of the Omnibus Election Code¹¹ is clear that it is the COMELEC who can declare a nuisance candidate. Further, the constitutional provision delineating the jurisdiction of the HRET did not vest the power to review the findings of the COMELEC with regard to ancillary matters not involving members of the House of Representatives.

Indeed, Rule 15 of the 2011 HRET Rules limits the kinds of election contests the Tribunal can take cognizance of to only two, namely: the election protest, and the petition for *quo warranto*; but such contests must be made only against a sitting Member of the House of Representatives, *viz*:

Rule 15. *How Initiated.* – An election contest is initiated by the filing of a verified petition of protest or a verified petition for *quo warranto* against a Member of the House of Representatives. An election protest shall not include a petition for *quo warranto*. Neither shall a petition for *quo warranto* include an election protest.

If the Tribunal is now to expand the present contest in order to find and declare that Alvin John was a nuisance candidate during the National and Local Elections in 2013, something that the COMELEC did not do despite it being the proper office under the Constitution to deal with and decide the question of being a nuisance candidate, the Tribunal would be committing a manifestly grave abuse of discretion amounting to lack or excess of jurisdiction for various reasons. To begin with, the Tribunal would be arbitrarily and unilaterally usurping the exclusive power of the COMELEC to conduct the elections because the ascertainment whether a person was a nuisance candidate or not is a function assigned to the COMELEC by the Constitution.¹² Secondly, the Tribunal would thereby

¹¹ Section 69. *Nuisance candidates.* – The Commission may *motu proprio* or upon a verified petition of an interested party, refuse to give due course to or cancel a certificate of candidacy if it is shown that said certificate has been filed to put the election process in mockery or disrepute or to cause confusion among the voters by the similarity of the names of the registered candidates or by other circumstances or acts which clearly demonstrate that the candidate has no bona fide intention to run for the office for which the certificate of candidacy has been filed and thus prevent a faithful determination of the true will of the electorate.

¹² Article IX (*Commission on Elections*), 1987 Constitution, pertinently provides:

Section 2. The Commission on Elections shall exercise the following powers and functions:

1. Enforce and administer all laws and regulations relative to the conduct of an election, plebiscite, initiative, referendum, and recall.

2. Exercise exclusive original jurisdiction over all contests relating to the elections, returns, and qualifications of all elective regional, provincial, and city officials, and appellate jurisdiction over all contests involving elective municipal officials decided by trial courts of general jurisdiction, or involving elective barangay officials decided by trial courts of limited jurisdiction. Decisions, final orders, or rulings of the Commission on election contests involving elective municipal and barangay offices shall be final, executory, and not appealable.

obliterate the constitutionally-guaranteed right of Alvin John to due process of law, it being clear and without question that his status as a candidate would be threshed out and determined without hearing him because he could never be made a party herein due to his not being a sitting Member of the House of Representatives. Thirdly, the Tribunal would decide the issue of Alvin John's being a nuisance candidate outside of a proper proceeding in the COMELEC. It is relevant to note in this connection that the Constitution has entrusted to the COMELEC the duty under Section 10, Article IX of the Constitution (*Commission on Elections*) to ensure that *bona fide* candidates for any public office "shall be free from any form of harassment and discrimination." And, fourthly, the COMELEC did not find and declare Alvin John to be a nuisance candidate. Hence, the Tribunal could not do so herein, because if that were to happen it would be assuming a review authority in respect of the action of the COMELEC on whether or not he was a nuisance candidate.

As earlier mentioned, the Supreme Court pronounced in its resolution promulgated on October 22, 2013 in G.R. No. 207199-200 that:

xxx the Court is now without jurisdiction to resolve the case at bar. As they stand, the issues concerning the conduct of the canvass and the resulting proclamation of Angelina as herein discussed are matters which fall under the scope of the terms "election" and "returns" as above-stated and hence, properly fall under the HRET's sole jurisdiction.

However, the meaning of the pronouncement of the Supreme Court cannot be stretched to denote that the Tribunal has now the power and the authority as well to consider and resolve issues concerning the qualifications of Alvin John who is not a Member of the House of Representatives.

WHEREFORE, the election protest *ad cautela* of protestant **WIGBERTO "TOBY" R. TAÑADA, JR.** is **DISMISSED** for being insufficient in form and in substance, and for lack of jurisdiction to pronounce and declare Alvin John S. Tañada as a nuisance candidate.

No pronouncement as to costs.

SO ORDERED.

Decide, except those involving the right to vote, all questions affecting elections, including determination of the number and location of polling places, appointment of election officials and inspectors, and registration of voters. xxxx

PRESBITERO J. VELASCO, JR.

Associate Justice, Supreme Court
Chairperson

DIOSDADO M. PERALTA

Associate Justice, Supreme Court
Member

LUCAS P. BERSAMIN

Associate Justice, Supreme Court
Member

I join the dissent of Rep. Bautista

FRANKLIN P. BAUTISTA

Representative
Second District, Davao del Sur
Member

I join the dissent of Rep. Mendoza

JOSELITO ANDREW R. MENDOZA

Representative
Third District, Bulacan
Member

MA. THERESA B. BONOAN

Representative
Fourth District, Manila
Member

WILFRIDO MARK M. ENVERGA

Representative
First District, Quezon
Member

I join the dissent of Rep. Ilagan

JERRY P. TREÑAS

Representative
Lone District, Iloilo City
Member


Dissenting:

LUZVIMINDA C. ILAGAN

Representative
Gabriela Partylist
Member

CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Rule 66 of the 2011 Rules of the House of Representatives Electoral Tribunal, it is hereby certified that the conclusions in the above Resolution of the Tribunal were arrived at in consultation before the case was assigned to a Member for writing the same.



PRESBITERO J. VELASCO, JR.
Chairperson

Copy furnished:

VILLAMOR & SANA LAW FIRM

Counsel for the Protestant

U3311 One Corporate Center
Julia Vargas Avenue cor. Meralco Avenue
Ortigas Center, Pasig City

G.E. GARCIA LAW OFFICES

Counsel for the Protestee

Ground Flr., LAIKO Bldg.
Cabildo St., Intramuros
Manila