

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY - PHILIPPINES
JOHN WESLEY SCHOOL OF LAW & GOVERNANCE
Cabanatuan City, Nueva Ecija

COURSE SYLLABUS ON CONSTITUTIONAL LAW 1
(WITH GRADING SYSTEM)

Course Title	:	Constitutional Law 1
Credit	:	3 Units
Time Allotment	:	54 Hours (Tuesdays 6:00-9:00p.m.)
Professor	:	ATTY. ALVIN T. CLARIDADES E-Mail Address: albinoski2005@yahoo.com Mobile Number: 09175792055 / 09325973383

1. COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to assist law students in acquiring a general knowledge of Constitutional Law 1. At the end of the term, the students are expected to have a working know-how of what comprises national territory and sovereign jurisdiction, the basic State policies and principles, the bill of fundamental rights, as well as the various constitutional provisions on the major branches of government and its instrumentalities

Specifically, the course syllabus is devised and planned in such a way as to enable the students to:

- understand the basic concepts, doctrines, and principles that underpin Philippine constitutional law;
- appreciate the various nuances of the Philippine bureaucracy and understand the role of key government agencies and other actors in its development;
- acquire knowledge of specific issues concerning pertinent constitutional provisions and jurisprudence.

2. COURSE AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

Upon completion of this course, the students must be able to:

- demonstrate an understanding of the major provisions of the constitution on state sovereignty and jurisdiction, the adoption of the generally accepted principles of international law, bill of rights, separation of powers, and the rest of the government structure.
- exhibit an understanding of the terminology, concepts, cases, and principles involved in the study of Constitutional law;
- know the application of laws and rules relating to the powers, functions, composition, and operation of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government, the various administrative agencies and instrumentalities, as well as the local government units.

3. LEARNING PLAN

LO	Week	Topics	Activities	Resources	Assessment Tools
LO1	1	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>I. Constitution</p> <p>A. Definition of Constitution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General 2. American 3. Filipino <p>B. Philosophical View of the Constitution</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marcos vs. Manglapus, G.R. No. 88211. October 27, 1989 <p>C. Purpose of the Constitution</p> <p>D. Constitution as a Municipal Law</p> <p>E. Classifications of Constitutions</p> <p>F. Qualities of a Good Written Constitution</p> <p>G. Essential Parts of a Good Written Constitution</p> <p>H. Permanence and Generality of Constitutions</p> <p>I. Interpretation/Construction of Constitution</p> <p>J. Brief Constitutional History</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Malolos Constitution 2. The American Regime and the Organic Acts 3. The 1935 Constitution 4. The Japanese (Belligerent) Occupation 5. The 1973 Constitution <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planas vs. Comelec, G.R. No. L-35925. January 22, 1973 • Javellana vs. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. L-36142. March 31, 1973 • Aquino vs. Enrile, G.R. No. L-35546. September 17, 1974 • Sanidad vs. Comelec, G.R. No. L-44640. October 12, 1976 • Occeña vs. Comelec, G.R. No. L-56350. April 2, 1981 • Phil. Bar Assoc. vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 72915, December 20, 1985 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The 1986 Freedom Constitution 7. The 1987 Constitution <p>II. Constitutional Law</p> <p>A. Concept of Constitutional Law</p> <p>B. Types of Constitutional Law</p> <p>C. Weight of American Jurisprudence</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Francisco vs. HoR, G.R. No. 160261. November 10, 2003 • Neri vs. Senate Committees, G.R. No. 180643. September 4, 2008 <p>III. Basic Concepts</p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<p>A. Constitutionalism</p> <p>B. Philippine Constitutionalism</p> <p>C. Doctrine of Constitutional Supremacy CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manila Prince Hotel vs. GSIS, G.R. No. 122156. February 3, 1997 • Garcia vs. Executive Secretary, G.R. No. 157584. April 2, 2009 • Ifurung vs Carpio-Morales, G.R. No. 232131. April 24, 2018 <p>D. Republicanism</p>			
LO2	2	<p>E. Principle of Separation of Powers</p> <p>1. In the Constitution</p> <p>a. The major departments (Art. VI, VII, and VIII)</p> <p>b. The constitutional commissions (Art. IX)</p> <p>c. The other independent bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Electoral Tribunals [Sec. 17, Art. VI and Sec. 4 (last par), Art. VII] • The Commission on Appointments (Sec. 18, Art. VI) • The Judicial and Bar Council (Sec. 8, Art. VIII)} <p>2. Manner of Conferment of Power</p> <p>a. Express</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative power to Congress (Sec. 1, Art. VI) • Executive power to the President (Sec. Art. VII) • Judicial power to SC, lower courts (Sec. 1, Art. VIII) • Others (e.g. powers of the independent constitutional bodies) <p>b. Implied (Doctrine of Necessary Implication)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arnault vs. Nazareno, G.R. No. L-3820. July 18, 1950 <p>c. Inherent or incidental CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In re McCulloch Dick., G.R. No. 13862. April 16, 1918 • In re Sotto, January 21, 1949, 82 Phil 595 <p>3. Purpose of separation of powers</p> <p>F. System of Checks and Balances</p> <p>1. Lawmaking by Congress, veto by the President, override of the veto by the Congress (Sec. 27, Art. VI)</p> <p>2. Grant of amnesty by the president, concurrence by the Congress (Sec. 19, Art. VI)</p> <p>3. Entry into treaty by the president, concurrence by the Senate (Sec. 20, Art. VII)</p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<p>4. Conviction by the judiciary, pardon by the President (Sec. 19, Art. VIII)</p> <p>5. Jurisdiction of courts may be reduced by the Congress (Sec. 2, Art. VIII)</p> <p>6. Congress may abolish lower courts (Sec. 1 and 2, Art. VIII)</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ocampo vs. Sec., G.R. No. L-7918, January 18, 1955 De la Llan vs. Alba, G.R. No. L-57883. March 12, 1982 <p>G. Judicial Review</p> <p>H. Due Process</p> <p>I. Corollary Concepts</p> <p>1. Blending (Overlap) of Powers</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Springer vs. PI, 277 US 189 <p>2. Checks and Balances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lawmaking by Congress, veto by the President, override of the veto by the Congress (Sec. 27, Art. VI) Grant of amnesty by the president, concurrence by the Congress (Sec. 19, Art. VI) Entry into treaty by the president, concurrence by the Senate (Sec. 20, Art. VII) Conviction by the judiciary, pardon by the President (Sec. 19, Art. VIII) Jurisdiction of courts may be reduced by the Congress (Sec. 2, Art. VIII) 			
LO3	3	<p>3. Delegation of Powers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Rule: potestas delegata non delegari potest ~ Basis Exception: instances of permissible delegation ~ Tariff powers to the president [Sec. 28 (2), Art. VI] ~ Emergency powers to the president [Sec 23 (2), Art. VI] <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abakada Guro Party List, vs. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. 168056, September 1, 2005 Freedom from Debt Coalition v. ERC, G.R. No. 161113, June 15, 2004, 432 SCRA 157 <p>~ Legislative power to the people at large: System on initiative and referendum (Sec. 32, Art. VI)</p> <p>~ Legislative power to LGUs (See Sec. 16 and 19 of RA 7160)</p> <p>~ Legislative power to administrative bodies (power of subordinate legislation)</p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cruz vs. Youngberg, G.R. No. L-34674. October 26, 1931 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Basis of delegation ○ How effected ○ Two tests of valid delegation <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Shipping Lines, Inc. vs. POEA, G.R. No. 76633. October 18, 1988 <p>a. Completeness test</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BOCEA v. Teves, G.R. No. 181704, December 6, 2011 <p>b. Sufficient standards test</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Shipping Lines vs. POEA, G.R. No. 76633 October 18, 1988 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Application of the two tests: concurrent, not alternate <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tatad vs. Executive Secretary, G.R. No. 124360. November 5, 1997 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delegation of ascertainment of facts, not delegation of legislative power <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abakada Guro vs. Ermita, GR 168056, September 1, 2005 (Decision) • Abakada Guro vs. Ermita, GR 168056, October 18, 2005 (Resolution) <p>4. Role of judiciary in separation of powers (Sec. 1, Art. VIII)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garcia v. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. 157584, April 2, 2009 <p>5. Supremacy of the Constitution upheld by the judiciary</p> <p>6. Justiciable and Political Questions</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KMU vs. Aquino, G.R. No. 210500, April 2, 2019 		
--	--	---	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ocampo v. Enriquez, G.R. No. 225973, November 8, 2016 Garcia v. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. 157584, April 2, 2009 Daza vs. Singson, 180 G.R. No. 86344. December 21, 1989 			
LO4	4	<p>7. Expanded jurisdiction under the 1987 Constitution [sec. 1 (2nd par.), Art. VIII]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also: Determination of the sufficiency of factual basis of Martial Law: Sec. 18, Art. VII Grant of plenary power to other branches: not bar to judicial inquiry <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bondoc vs. Pineda, G.R. No. 97710. September 26, 1991 <p><u>THE 1987 CONSTITUTION</u></p> <p>I. Preamble</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Meaning Function <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Function Origin/ Authorship Scope and Purpose Social Contract Theory <p>II. Art. I: National Territory</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Territory Archipelagic State; archipelago <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition under the 1982 U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) Philippine Archipelago Archipelagic Waters Archipelagic principle <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archipelagic Doctrine under Article I, Section 1 <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Magallona vs. Ermita, G.R No. 187167. August 16, 2011 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archipelagic waters, Territorial sea <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Sovereignty exercised by the coastal state ~ Right of innocent passage: ships of other States Internal waters Elements of Archipelagic Doctrine Definition of internal waters The Straight Baseline Method of delineating the territorial sea <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Baselines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Definition under the UNCLOS 	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii Ways of drawing baselines: normal baseline method vs. straight baseline method: See Art. 7 (1), UNCLOS iii Republic Act No. 9522 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Purpose of Archipelagic Doctrine <p>4. Archipelagic (internal/inland) waters: par.1, Art. I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sovereignty by coastal state; no right of innocent passage <p>5. Significant phrase: <i>“and all other territories over which the Philippines has sovereignty or jurisdiction”</i></p> <p>III. Art. II: Fundamental Principles & State Policies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Principles and State Policies 2. The State as a Legal Concept (§ 2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Definition o Elements of a State <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. People b. Territory c. Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Government of the Republic of the Philippines o Government vs. Administration o Functions: Constituent vs. Ministrant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Constituent <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veterans Federation of the Phils. vs. Reyes G. R. No. 155027. February 28, 2006 • MIAA vs. CA, G.R. No. 155650. July 20, 2006 • Badillo vs. Tayag, G. R. No. 143976. April 3, 2003 ~ Ministrant <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spouses Fontanilla vs. Maliaman, G.R. Nos. L-55963 & 61045. February 27, 1991 • PVTA vs. CIR, G.R. No. L-32052, July 25, 1975 • Shipline Incorporated vs. CA, G.R. No. 143377. February 20, 2001 			
LO5	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Classification of Government on the Basis of Legitimacy: De jure vs. De facto <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawyer’s League vs. Aquino, G.R. No. 73748. 73972. May 22, 1986 	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report,</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Ca</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estrada vs. Arroyo, G.R. No. 146710-15. March 2, 2001 o Kinds of de facto government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i The government that gets possession and control or, or usurps, by force or by the voice of majority ii Established and maintained by invading military forces iii Government of paramount force o Presidential vs. Parliamentary form of government o Doctrine of Parens Patriae <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gov't vs. Monte de Piedad, G.R. No. L-9959. December 13, 1916 • Cabanas vs. Pilapil, G.R. No. L-25843. July 25, 1974 d. Sovereignty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Definition o Kinds <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legal 2. Political 3. Internal 4. External o Characteristics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. permanent 2. exclusive 3. comprehensive 4. absolute 5. indivisible 6. inalienable 7. imprescriptible o Effects of Belligerent Occupation o Effects of Change in Sovereignty o Dominion vs. Imperium o Jurisdiction o "Sovereignty resides in the people" o Types: Legal vs. Political sovereignty o Doctrine of Jus Postliminium o Effect of suspension or change in sovereignty <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co Kim Chan vs. Valdez, G.R. No. L-5. September 17, 1945 	<p>Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>se Laws</p>	<p>recitation</p>
--	--	--	----------------	-------------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peralta vs. Director of Prisons, G.R. No. L-49. November 12, 1945 • Alcantara vs. Director of Prisons, G.R. No. L-49. November 12, 1945 • Laurel vs. Misa, G.R. No. L-409. January 30, 1947 • Macariola vs. Asuncion, A.M. No. 133-J. May 31, 1982 			
LO6	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concept of “Act of State” ○ State Immunity from suit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DOTC v. Abecina, G.R. No. 206484, June 29, 2016 b. Suits Against Public Officials as Suits Against the State <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test: will require an affirmative act from the State <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOH vs. Phil Pharma Wealth, Inc., G.R. No. 182358, February 20, 2013 c. Effect when public officer acts without, or in excess of, jurisdiction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Festejo vs. Fernando, G.R. No. L-5156, March 11, 1954 (<i>The text of the main opinion is in Spanish. Use google to translate each paragraph to English and read the dissenting opinion of Justice Concepcion.</i>) d. Suits Against Government Agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Test <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If incorporated: consult charter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arcega vs. CA, G.R, No. L-20869. August 28, 1975 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of Case Digests Online Group/Individual Report, Lecture Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Library Computer / Internet Books/Case Laws 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading of submitted Case Digests Graded recitation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PNR vs. IAC, G.R. No. 70547. January 22, 1993 <p>2. If unincorporated: determine nature of primary function CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bureau of Printing vs. Bureau of Printing Employees Association, G.R. No. L-15761. January 28, 1961 • Mobil Philippines Exploration, Inc. vs. Customs Arrastre Service, G.R. No. L-23139. December 17, 1966 <p>e. Suits against Foreign States CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanders vs. Veridiano II, G.R. No. L-46930. June 10, 1988 • Holy See, The vs. Rosario, Jr., G.R. No. 101949. December 1, 1994 • US vs. Guinto, G.R. No. 76607, February 26, 1990 <p>f. Waiver of Immunity: Consent to be Sued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Forms of Consent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Express <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thru a general law (Read Act No. 3083 and Commonwealth Act No. 327, as amended by PD 1445) CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amigable vs. Cuenca, G.R. No. L-26400. February 29, 1972 b. Thru a special law CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merritt vs. Government of the Philippine Islands, G.R. 			
--	--	--	--	--

		No. 11154. March 21, 1916			
LO7	7	<p>2. Implied</p> <p>1. When the State commences litigation CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Froilan vs. Pan Oriental Shipping Co., G.R. No. L-6060, September 30, 1950 Lim vs. Brownell, G.R. No. L-8587. March 24, 1960 <p>b. When State enters into a contract CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> US vs. Ruiz, G.R. No. L-35645. May 22, 1985 US vs. Guinto, G.R. No. 76607. February 26, 1990 <p>g. Suit allowed even without consent to be sued CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Santiago vs. Republic, G.R. No. L-48214. December 19, 1978 <p>h. Consent to be Sued not Consent to Execution of Judgment CASE:</p> <p>Rep. vs. Villasor, G.R. No. L-30671. November 28, 1973</p> <p>1. Exception CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PNB vs. Pabalan, G.R. No. L-33112. June 15, 1978 <p>i. Suability vs. Liability 1. Read also The Local Government Code of 1991 CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Republic vs. NLRC, G.R. No. 120385 October 17, 1996 Palafox vs. Ilocos Norte, G.R. No. L-10659, January 31, 1958 	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j. Exemptions from Legal Requirements of the State k. Restrictive State Immunity: adhered by the Philippines <p>3. Republicanism (Sec. 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Also: Supremacy of Civilian Authority (§ 3) o Essential Features o Manifestations of Republicanism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ours is a government of laws and not of men. CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republic vs. Southside HOA, Inc., G.R. No. 156951, September 22, 2006 b. Rule of Majority (Plurality in elections) c. Accountability of public officials d. Bill of Rights e. Legislature cannot pass irrevocable laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abas Kida vs. Senate, G.R. No. 196271, February 28, 2012 • City of Davao vs. RTC Br. XII, G.R. No. 127383 August 18, 2005 f. Separation of powers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Democratic State ii Constitutional Authoritarianism g. Renunciation of War and Incorporation clause (§ 2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. See also: Independent Foreign Policy (Sec. 7) and Nuclear-Free Policy (Sec. 8) ii. See also Sec. 25, Art. XIII: Re former US Military Bases CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bayan Muna vs. Romulo, G.R. No. 159618, February 1, 2011 • Secretary of Justice vs. Lantion, G.R. No. 139465, January 18, 2000 h. Supremacy of Civilian Authority (§3) CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manalo vs. Sistoza, G.R. No. 107369. August 11, 1999 			
LO8	8	<p>4. Defense of the State (§4) CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People vs. Lagman, G.R. No. L-45892. July 13, 1938 • People vs. De Sosa, G.R. No. L-45893. July 13, 1938 <p>5. Peace and Order (§5) CASES:</p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report,</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kilosbayan vs. Morato, G.R. No. 118910. November 16, 1995 • Chavez vs. Romulo, G.R. No. 157036. June 9, 2004 <p>6. Separation of Church and State (§6)</p> <p>1. See also Sec. 5, Art. III (The non-establishment clause and free-exercise clause)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peralta vs. Philpost, G.R. No. 223395, December 04, 2018 <p>7. STATE POLICIES</p> <p>8. Independent Foreign Policy (§7)</p> <p>9. Freedom from Nuclear Weapons (§8)</p> <p>10. Just and Dynamic Social Order (§9)</p> <p>11. Promotion of Social Justice (§10)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calalang vs. Williams, G.R. No. 47800. December 2, 1940 <p>12. Respect for Human Dignity (§11)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basco vs. PAGCOR, G.R. No. 91649. May 14, 1991 <p>13. Family, Rearing the Youth, and Women (§§ 12-14)</p> <p>2. Family, Youth, and Women (Sec. 12-14)</p> <p>a. See Sec. 14, Art. XIII (re: working women)</p> <p>b. See also Art. XIV (The Family)</p> <p>c. Read the salient features of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PT&T vs. NLRC, G.R. No. 118978. May 23, 1997 <p>14. Health (§15) and Balanced and healthful Ecology (§ 16)</p> <p>3. Right to Health (Sec. 15); Right to Healthful and Balanced Ecology (Sec. 16)</p> <p>4. See also the Rule on the Writ of Kalikasan</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LLDA vs. CA, G.R. No. 110120, March 16, 1994 • Oposa vs. Factoran, G.R. No. 101083. July 30, 1993 <p>15. Education, Science and Technology (§17)</p> <p>5. Read also Art. XIV (Education, Science and Technology, etc.)</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guingona vs. Carague, G.R. No. 94571. April 22, 1991 • Philippine Merchant Marine School Inc. vs. CA, G.R. No. 112844. June 2, 1995 	<p>Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>se Laws</p>	<p>recitation</p>
--	---	--	----------------	-------------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRC vs. DeGuzman, G.R. No. 144681. June 21, 2004 <p>16. Labor as primary social economic force (§ 18)</p> <p>6. Relate with Sec. 13, Art. XIII</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serrano vs. Gallant Maritime Services, Inc., G.R. No. 167614, March 24, 2009 (Read the concurring opinion of Justice Brion) • JMM Promotion and Management, Inc. vs. CA, G.R. No. 120095. August 5, 1996 • Philippine Association of Service Exporters, Inc. vs. Drilon, G.R. No. 81958. June 30, 1988 <p>17. Economy (§19)</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garcia vs. BOI, G.R. No. 92024. November 9, 1990 • Tanada vs. Angara, G.R. No. 118295. May 2, 1997 <p>18. Private Sector and Private Enterprise (§20)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Radio Communications Association vs. Reyes, G.R. No. 86953. November 6, 1990 			
	9		Midterm Examination	Library Computer / Internet Books/Case Laws	Checking and Grading of Midterm Examination Answer Booklets Submission of Midterm Grades
LO9	10	<p>19. Comprehensive Rural Development (§21)</p> <p>7. National Economy (Sec. 19-21)</p> <p>8. Read also Art. XII (National Economy and Patrimony)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garcia vs. Corona, G.R. No. 132451, December 17, 1999 <p>20. Indigenous Cultural Communities (§22)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cruz vs. Secretary of ENR, G.R. No. 135385. December 6, 2000 <p>21. Sectoral Organizations (§23)</p> <p>22. Communication and Information (§24)</p> <p>CASE:</p>	Submission of Case Digests Online Group/Individual Report, Lecture Oral Recitation, Canvas	Library Computer / Internet Books/Case Laws	Grading of submitted Case Digests Graded recitation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLDT vs. NTC, G.R. No. 88404. October 18, 1990 <p>23. Local Autonomy (§25)</p> <p>9. Read Art. X (Local Government)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dadole vs. COA, G.R. No. 125350. December 3, 2002 <p>24. Equal Access to Opportunities (§26)</p> <p>10. Opportunities for Public Service and Anti-Political Dynasty (Sec. 26)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pamatong vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 161872, April 13, 2004 <p>25. Public Service (§27)</p> <p>11. Honesty and Integrity in Public Service (Sec. 27)</p> <p>1. Read Art. XI (Accountability of Public Officers)</p> <p>12. Full disclosure of Public Transactions (Sec. 27)</p> <p>1. Also read Sec. 7, Art. III, the right to information on matters of public concern</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Cotabato vs. Government of RP, G.R. No. 183591, October 14, 2008 <p>26. Full Public Disclosure (§28)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Akbayan vs. Aquino, G.R. No. 170516. July 16, 2008 <p>27. Social Justice and Human Rights (Sec. 9-11; 18; 21)</p> <p>1. See also Art. XIII (Social Justice and Human Rights)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Association of Small Landowners vs. Secretary of Agrarian, 175 SCRA 343 <p>28. Art II provisions generally not self-executing</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manila Prince Hotel vs. GSIS, G.R. No. 122156. February 3, 1997 (Read also the dissenting and concurring opinions) <p>IV. LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT</p> <p>1. <i>Legislative Power (§1)</i></p> <p>A. Definition of Legislative Power</p> <p>B. Where Vested</p> <p>C. Classification of Legislative Power</p> <p>D. Scope of Legislative power</p> <p>CASE:</p>	<p>Discussion, Quiz</p>		
--	--	-------------------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vera vs. Avelino, G.R. No. L-543. August 31, 1946 <p>E. Limitations on Legislative Power</p> <p>F. Non-delegability of Legislative power</p> <p>G. Rationale of the Doctrine of Non-delegability</p> <p>H. Valid delegation of legislative powers</p> <p>I. Delegation of rule-making power</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abakada Guru Party List Officers vs. Executive Secretary, G.R. 168056, September 1, 2005. Reconsidered October 18, 2005 Gerochi vs. DOE. G.R. No. 159796. July 17, 2007 			
LO10	11	<p>J. Requisites for a valid delegation of rule-making power</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pelaez vs. Auditor General, G.R. No. L-23825. December 24, 1965 <p>K. Sufficient Standards</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Osmeña vs. Orbos, G.R. No. 99886 March 31, 1993 Tablarin vs. Gutierrez, G.R. No. 78164. July 31, 1987 Chiongbian vs. Orbos, G.R. No. 96754 June 22, 1995 Bayan vs. Ermita, G.R. No. 169838. April 25, 2006 <p>L. Examples of Invalid of Delegation</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ynot vs. IAC, G.R. No. 74457 March 20, 1987 People vs. Dacuycuy, G.R. No. L-45127 May 5, 1989 US vs. Ang Tang Ho, G.R. No. 17122. February 27, 1922 Compania General de Tabacos de Filipinas vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners, G.R. No. L-11216. March 6, 1916 <p>2. Powers of Congress</p> <p>A. Inherent Powers</p> <p>B. Express Powers</p> <p>3. Congress (§§ 2-10)</p> <p>A. Composition of Congress</p> <p>B. Bicameralism vs. Unicameralism</p> <p>C. Composition of the Senate</p> <p>D. Qualification of Senators</p> <p>E. Senators' Term of Office / Staggering of Terms</p> <p>F. Composition of HoR</p> <p>G. Qualifications of Members of HoR</p> <p>H. Domicile</p> <p>CASE:</p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Romualdez-Marcos vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 119976, September 18, 1995 • Domino vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 134015. July 19, 1999 • Perez vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 133944. October 28, 1999 <p>I. Property Qualification</p> <p>J. Term of Office of Representatives</p> <p>1. Term vs. Tenure CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alba vs. Evangelista, G.R. No. L-10360. January 17, 1957 <p>2. Voluntary renunciation of office CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fariñas vs. Exec. Secretary, G.R. No. 147387. December 10, 2003 <p>K. Party-List System CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Veterans' Federation Party vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 136781. October 6, 2000 • CIBAC vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 172103. April 13, 2007 • Ang Bagong Bayani-OFW Labor Party vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 147589, June 26, 2001 <p>L. Legislative Districts</p> <p>(a) Apportionment CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matias vs. Comelec, G.R. No. L-18684. September 14, 1961, 3 SCRA 1 • Tobias vs. Abalos, G.R. No. L-114783. December 8, 1994, 239 SCRA 106 <p>(b) Reapportionment CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mariano vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 118577. March 7, 1995, 242 SCRA 211 			
LO1 1	12	<p>(c) Gerrymandering</p> <p>M. Election</p> <p>(a) Regular Election CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocampo vs. HRET, G.R. No. 158466. June 15, 2004, 432 SCRA 144 <p>(b) Special Election CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tolentino vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 148334. January 21, 2004, 420 SCRA 438 <p>N. Salaries</p> <p>4. Privileges of Members (§ 11)</p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion,</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

	<p>A. Privilege from Arrest CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trillanes vs. Pimentel, G.R. No. 179817. June 27, 2008, 556 SCRA 471 <p>B. Parliamentary freedom of speech and debate CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jimenez vs. Cabangbang, G.R. No. L-15905. August 3, 1966 <p>5. <i>Duty to Disclose, Disqualifications and Prohibitions (§§ 12-14)</i> CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puyat vs. De Guzman, G.R. No. L-51122. March 25, 1982 <p>6. <i>Internal Government of Congress (§§ 15-16)</i></p> <p>A. Sessions B. Adjournment C. Officers CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Santiago vs. Guingona, G.R. No. 134577. November 18, 1998 <p>D. Quorum CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People vs. Jalosjos, G.R. No. 132875-76. February 3, 2000 • Arroyo vs. De Venecia, G.R. No. 127255. June 26, 1998 <p>E. Internal Rules F. Disciplinary Powers CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Osmeña vs. Pendatun, G.R. No. L-17144. October 28, 1960 <p>G. Legislative Journal and Congressional Record H. Enrolled Bill Doctrine CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phil. Judges Association, G.R. No. 105371. November 11, 1993 • Mabanag vs. Lopez Vito, G.R. No. L-1123. March 5, 1947 • Casco Philippine Chemical Co. vs. Gimenez, G.R. No. L-17931 February 28, 1963 • Morales vs. Subido, G.R. No. L-29658. February 27, 1969 <p>7. <i>Electoral Tribunal, CA (§§17-19)</i></p> <p>A. HRET CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guerrero vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 137004. July 26, 2000 <p>B. SET CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rasul vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 134142. August 24, 1999 <p>C. CA</p>	<p>Quiz</p>		
--	--	-------------	--	--

		<p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daza vs. Singson, G.R. No. 86344. December 21, 1989 • Coseteng vs. Mitra, G.R. No. 86649. July 12, 1990 • Guingona vs. Gonzales, G.R. No. 106971 October 20, 1992 <p>8. <i>Records and Books of Accounts (§ 20)</i></p>			
LO1 2	13	<p>9. <i>Inquiries/Oversight function (§§ 21-22)</i></p> <p>A. <i>Inquiries in Aid of Legislation</i></p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arnault vs. Nazareno, G.R. No. L-3820. July 18, 1950, 87 Phil 29 • Senate vs. Ermita, G.R. No. 169777, April 20, 2006 <p>B. <i>Oversight Functions</i></p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macalintal vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 157013. July 10, 2003 <p>10. <i>Emergency Powers (§ 23)</i></p> <p>A. Declaration of the existence of a state of war</p> <p>B. Delegation of emergency power</p> <p>11. <i>Bills/Legislative Process (§ 24,26,27)</i></p> <p>A. <i>Origination Clause</i></p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tolentino vs. Sec. of Finance, G.R. No. 115455 August 25, 1994 <p>B. <i>One bill-one subject rule</i></p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PHILCONSA vs. Gimenez, G.R. No. L-23326. December 18, 1965 • Central Capiz vs. Ramirez, G.R. No. L-16197. March 12, 1920 • Sumulong vs. Comelec, G.R. No. L-48609. October 10, 1941 <p>C. Passage of a bill</p> <p>D. <i>Presidential Approval, Veto or Inaction; Legislative Reconsideration</i></p> <p>(a) Presidential Approval</p> <p>(b) Presidential Veto</p> <p>(c) Presidential Inaction</p> <p>E. <i>Item Veto</i></p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIR vs. CTA, G.R. No. L-47421. May 14, 1990 • Bengzon vs. Drilon, G.R. No. 103524. April 15, 1992 <p>F. <i>Doctrine of inappropriate provisions</i></p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gonzales vs. Macaraig, G.R. No. 87636. November 19, 1990 <p>G. <i>Executive Impoundment Legislative Veto</i></p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<p>12. <i>Power of the Purse/Fiscal Powers (§§ 28, 29, 25)</i> CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sison vs. Ancheta, G.R. No. L-59431. July 25, 1984 • Planters Products, Inc. (PPI) vs. Fertiphil Corp., G.R. No. 166006, March 14, 2008 <p>13. <i>Other Prohibited Measures (§§30-31)</i> 14. <i>Initiative and Referendum (§ 32)</i> CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lambino vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 174153. October 25, 2006 <p>V. EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT</p> <p>1. <i>Executive Power (§ 1)</i> CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEA vs. COA, G.R. No. 143481. February 15, 2002 • Webb vs. De Leon, G.R. No. 121234. August 23, 1995 • Soliven vs. Makasiar, G.R. No. 82585. November 14, 1988 <p>2. <i>The President (§2-13)</i> A. Who is he? B. Qualifications C. Election D. Term of Office E. Oath of Office F. Privileges G. Prohibitions/Inhibitions</p>			
LO1 3	14	<p>H. Vacancy Situations I. Rules of Succession CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estrada vs. Macapagal-Arroyo, G.R. No. 146738. March 2, 2001 <p>J. Temporary Disability K. Serious Illness L. Removal from Office</p> <p>3. <i>The Vice-President</i> 4. <i>Powers of the President</i> A. Executive Power B. Power of Appointment (§ 14-16) (a) Definition of Appointment (b) Nature of Power of Appointment CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government vs. Springer, G.R. No. L-26979. April 1, 1927 • Binamira vs. Garrucho, G.R. No. 92008. July 30, 1990 • Bermudez vs. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. 131429. August 4, 1999 <p>(c) Classification of Appointment i. Permanent</p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Temporary CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valencia vs. Peralta, G.R. No. L-20864 August 23, 1963 iii. Regular iv. Ad Interim CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matibag vs. Benipayo, G.R. No. 149036. April 2, 2002 <p>(d) Kinds of Presidential Appointment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Appointments made by an Acting President (§ 14) ii. Appointments made by the President within two months before the next presidential elections and up to the end of his term (§ 15) iii. Regular Appointments (§ 16) iv. Recess or Ad Interim Appointments (§ 13) <p>(e) Scope of Appointing Power</p> <p>(f) Appointments needing Confirmation of CA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. CA Confirmation CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarmiento vs. Mison, G.R. No. 79974 December 17, 1987 • Soriano vs. Lista, G.R. No. 153881. March 24, 2003 • Manalo vs. Sistoza, G.R. No. 107369. August 11, 1999 ii. Exclusive List CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bautista vs. Salonga, G.R. No. 86439. April 13, 1989 • Calderon vs. Carale, G.R. No. 91636. April 23, 1992 <p>(g) Officials Who are to be Appointed by the President</p> <p>(h) Steps in the Appointing Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Nomination by the President ii. Confirmation of the Commission on Appointments iii. Issuance of the Commission 			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacson vs. Romero, G.R. No. L-3081. October 14, 1949 <p>(i) Appointment of Officers Lower in Rank</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rufino vs. Endriga, G.R. No. 139554. July 21, 2006 			
LO1 4	15	<p>(j) Limitations on the President's Appointing power</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Re Appointment of Mateo Valenzuela, A.M. No. 98-5-01-SC November 9, 1998 De Rama vs. CA, G.R. No. 131136. February 28, 2001 <p>(k) Power of Removal</p> <p>C. Power of Control (§ 17)</p> <p>(a) Control</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mondano vs. Silvosa, G.R. No. L-7708. May 30, 1955 <p>(b) Control vs. Supervision</p> <p>(c) The President and Power of Control</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NAMARCO vs. Arca, G.R. No. L-25743. September 30, 1969 Ang-angco vs. Castillo, G.R. No. L-17169. November 30, 1963 City of Iligan vs. Director of Lands, G.R. No. L-30852. February 26, 1988 Lacson-Magallanes Co., Inc. vs. Paño, G.R. No. L-27811. November 17, 1967 <p>(d) Alter ego Principle; Doctrine of Qualified Political Agency</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Villena vs. Sec. of Interior, G.R. No. L-46570. April 21, 1939 Orosa vs. Roa, GR 14047, July 14, 2006 DENR vs. DENR Employees, G.R. No. 149724. August 19, 2003 ABAKADA Guro Party List vs. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. 168056 September 1, 2005 <p>(e) Supervision over LGUs</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drilon vs. Lim, G.R. No. 112497. August 4, 1994 	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

		<p>(f) Faithful Execution Clause (The Take-Care Clause)</p> <p>D. Military Powers (§ 18)</p> <p>(a) The Military Power and its Limitations CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sanlakas vs. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. 159085. February 3, 2004 </p> <p>(b) Commander-in-Chief Clause/Calling Out Power CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gudani vs. Senga, G.R. No. 170165, August 15, 2006 Sanlakas vs. Exec. Sec., G.R. No. 159085, February 3, 2004 David vs. Ermita, G.R. No. 171409, May 3, 2006 </p> <p>(c) Suspension of the Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aberca vs. Ver, G.R. No. L-69866. April 15, 1988 </p> <p>(d) Martial Law CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Olaguer vs. Military Commission, G.R. No. L-54558. May 22, 1987 </p> <p>E. Pardoning Power (Executive Clemency) (§ 19) CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Torres vs. Gonzales, G.R. No. 76872. July 23, 1987 Monsanto vs. Factoran, G.R. No. 78239. February 9, 1989 Garcia vs. COA, G.R. No. 75025. September 14, 1993 People vs. Casido, G.R. No. 116512. March 7, 1997 Vera vs. People, G.R. No. L-18184. January 31, 1963 Republic vs. IAC, G.R. No. L-69344. April 26, 1991 Drilon vs. CA, G.R. No. 91626. October 3, 1991 </p>			
LO1 5	16	<p>F. Borrowing Power (§ 20) CASE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spouses Constantino vs. Cuisia, G.R. 106064, October 13, 2005 </p> <p>G. Diplomatic Power (Foreign Affairs) (§ 21) CASES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pimentel vs. Executive Secretary, G.R. No. 158088. July 6, 2005 Commissioner of Customs vs. Eastern Sea Trading, G.R. No. L-14279. October 31, 1961 </p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation,</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In re R. McCulloch Dick, G.R. No. 13862. April 16, 1918 • Tan Tong vs. Deportation Board, G.R. No. L-7680. April 30, 1955 <p>H. Budgetary Power (§ 22)</p> <p>I. Informing Power (§ 23)</p> <p>J. Other Powers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Call Congress to a Special Session (Art 6, § 15) (b) Power to approve or veto bills (Art. 6, § 27) (c) To consent to deputation of government personnel by the Commission on Elections (Art. 19-C, § 2(4)) (d) To discipline such deputies (Art 19-C, § 2(8)) (e) Emergency powers by delegation from Congress (Art. 6, § 23(2)) (f) Tariff Powers by delegation from Congress (Art. 6, § 28(2)) (g) General Supervision over local governments and autonomous regional governments (Art. 10) <p>VI. JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT</p> <p>1. <i>Judicial Department</i> CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bengzon vs. Drilon, G.R. No. 103524. April 15, 1992 <p>2. <i>Judicial Power (§ 1)</i> CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infotech vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 159139. June 15, 2005 • Channie Tan vs. Republic, G.R. No. L-14159. April 18, 1960 • Santiago, Jr. vs. Bautista, G.R. No. L-25024. March 30, 1970 • Felipe vs. Leuterio, G.R. No. L-4606. May 30, 1952 <p>3. <i>Jurisdiction (§ 2)</i> CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • De La Cruz vs. CA, G.R. No. 139442. December 6, 2006 • Echegaray vs Sec. of Justice, G.R. No. 132601. January 19, 1999 <p>4. <i>The Supreme Court (§§ 4, 7-12)</i> CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In re JBC vs. Judge Quitain, JBC No. 013, August 22, 2007 • Kilosbayan vs. Ermita, G.R. No. 177721, July 3, 2007 • Nitafan vs. CIR, G.R. No. 78780. July 23, 1987 • In Re: First Indorsement from Hon. Raul Gonzalez, A.M. No. 88-4-5433, April 15, 1988 	<p>Canvas Discussion, Quiz</p>		
--	--	--------------------------------	--	--

		<p>5. <i>Powers of the Supreme Court</i> (§§ 5, 6, 11, 16)</p> <p>A. General Power</p> <p>B. Specific Powers</p> <p>(a) Original Jurisdiction</p> <p>(b) Appellate Jurisdiction</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People vs. Mateo, G.R. No. 147678-87. July 7, 2004 • People vs. Laguna, G.R. No. 170565, January 31, 2006 • People vs. Rocha and Ramos, G.R. No. 173797, August 31, 2007 <p>(c) Temporary Assignment of Judges</p> <p>(d) Change of Venue or Place of Trial</p>			
LO1 6	17	<p>(e) Rule-Making Power</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maniago vs. CA, G.R. No. 104392. February 20, 1996 • Fabian vs. Desierto, G.R. No. 129742. September 16, 1998 • People vs. Lacson, G.R. No. 149453. April 1, 2003 • PNB vs. Asuncion, G.R. No. L-46095. November 23, 1977 • Santero vs. CFI, G.R. Nos. L-61700-03. September 14, 1987 • Damasco vs. Laqui, G.R. No. 81381. September 30, 1988 • Zaldivia vs. Reyes, G.R. No. 102342. July 3, 1992 • LBP vs. De Leon, G.R. No. 143275. March 20, 2003 • In Re: Request for Creation of Special Division, A.M. No. 02-1-07-SC, January 21, 2002 <p>(f) Appointment of Court Personnel (§5)</p> <p>(g) Administrative Supervision of Courts (§6)</p> <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maceda vs. Vasquez, G.R. No. 102781 April 22, 1993 • Fuentes vs. Office of the Ombudsman-Mindanao, GR. No. 124295. October 23, 2001 <p>(h) Disciplinary/Dismissal Powers (§11)</p> <p>CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People vs. Gacott, Jr., G.R. No. 116049. July 13, 1995 <p>(i) Contempt Powers</p> <p>(j) Annual Report</p> <p>(k) Other powers</p> <p>6. <i>Judicial Review</i></p>	<p>Submission of Case Digests Online</p> <p>Group/Individual Report, Lecture</p> <p>Oral Recitation, Canvas Discussions and Quiz</p>	<p>Library</p> <p>Computer / Internet</p> <p>Books/Case Laws</p>	<p>Grading of submitted Case Digests</p> <p>Graded recitation</p>

	<p>A. Requisites of Judicial Inquiry/Judicial Review CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Francisco, Jr. vs. Nagmamalasakit na mga Manananggol ng mga Manggagawang Pilipino, Inc., G.R. No. 160262. November 10, 2003 • David vs. Macapagal-Arroyo, G.R. No. 171409, May 3, 2006 <p>B. Moot case CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Province of Batangas vs. Romulo, G.R. No. 152774. May 27, 2004 • Quizon vs. Comelec, G.R. No. 177927, February 15, 2008 <p>C. Standing/Proper Party CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legaspi vs. CSC, G.R. No. L-72119. May 29, 1987 • Francisco, Jr. vs. Fernando, G.R. No. 166501. November 16, 2006 • Joya vs. PCGG, G.R. No. 96541. August 24, 1993 • Gonzales vs. Narvasa, G.R. No. 140835. August 14, 2000 <p>D. Facial Challenge CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estrada vs. Sandiganbayan, G.R. No. 148560, November 19, 2001 <p>E. Political Questions CASE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tañada vs. Cuenco, G.R. 1, No. L-10520. February 28, 1957 <p>7. <i>Deciding a Case</i> (§§ 4, 13-15) CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Francisco vs. Permskul, G.R. No. 81006. May 12, 1989 • Borromeo vs. CA, G.R. No. 82273. June 1, 1990 • Prudential Bank vs. Castro, A.M. No. 2756. March 15, 1988 • Hernandez vs. CA, G.R. No. 104874. December 14, 1993 <p>8. <i>Other Courts</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Court of Appeals B. Court of Tax Appeals C. Sandiganbayan D. Regional Trial Courts E. Metropolitan Trial Courts F. Municipal Trial Courts in Cities G. Municipal Trial Courts H. Municipal Circuit Trial Courts I. Shari'ah Circuit Courts J. Shari'ah District Courts K. Bangsamoro Shari'ah High Court <p>CASES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J.M. Tuason & Co. vs. CA, G.R. No. L-18128. December 26, 1961 			
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ynot vs. IAC, G.R. No. 74457. March 20, 1987 			
	18		Final Examination	Library Computer / Internet Books/Case Laws	Checking and Grading of Final Examination Answer Booklets Submission of Final Grades

4. STUDENT'S OUTPUTS

As evidence of attaining the above learning outcomes, the student is required to do and submit the following during the indicated dates of the term.

Teaching-Learning Activities	Assessment Tasks
MODULE 1 – LO1-LO4	Oral Recitations, Reports, Case Digests, Written Tests
MODULE 2 – LO5-LO8	Oral Recitations, Reports, Case Digests, Written Tests
MODULE 3 – LO9-LO12	Oral Recitations, Reports, Case Digests, Written Tests
MODULE 4 – LO13-LO16	Oral Recitations, Reports, Case Digests, Written Tests

5. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

- The student must regularly attend the virtual class.
- Active participation in class discussion/oral recitation is required.
- Each student has to take and pass all formative (quizzes, written assignments, case digests, reports, etc.) and summative tests (midterm/final exams). Homework must be submitted the next meeting.

6. GRADING SYSTEM

Rating periods. The students will be graded for two (2) periods within the semester (midterm and final rating periods) according to the following:

1. Class Attendance	15%
2. Participation in Class Discussion / Oral Recitation	15%

3. Individual Formative Tests, Homework, Case Digests	15%
4. Summative Examination (Midterm and Final Exams)	55%
TOTAL	100%

Final Grade. The students will be given their respective final grades based on their average grades (AGs) in the mid-grading period (1st half of the term) and in the final grading grade (2nd half). The midterm rating has a weight of 45% and the final grading period accounts for 55% of the final grade.

- SCHOOL OF LAW JD GRADING SYSTEM:**

Number	Percentage Equivalent	Description
1.00	98 and above	Excellent A
1.25	94 to <98	
1.50	90 to <94	Superior
1.75	86 to <90	
2.00	83 to <86	Very Good B
2.25	80 to <83	
2.50	78 to <80	Good
2.75	76 to <78	
3.00	75 to <76	Competent
5.00	Below 75	Fail

Prepared and submitted by:

Approved by:

ATTY. ALVINT. CLARIDADES

DEAN SALVADOR B. BELARO