

1. MANILA PRINCE HOTEL v. GSIS

Facts: The government was selling the Manila Hotel, and a foreign company offered a higher bid than Manila Prince Hotel. Manila Prince argued that qualified Filipinos should be given preference in matters involving national patrimony.

Issue: Whether the Filipino company should be given preference.

Ruling: **YES. Under Article XII, Section 10(2) of the 1987 Constitution**, qualified Filipinos must be given preference in matters involving the national economy and patrimony. The provision is self-executing and may be directly enforced.

2. PAMATONG v. COMELEC

Facts: Victoriano Pamatong wanted to run for President, but COMELEC considered him a nuisance candidate. Pamatong argued that he had the right to run for President.

Issue: Whether everyone has an absolute right to run for President.

Ruling: **NO. Under Article II, Section 26 of the 1987 Constitution**, the State shall guarantee equal access to opportunities for public service, but the right to run for public office is not an absolute right.

3. ESPINA v. ZAMORA

Facts: The petitioners questioned a government action involving the constitutional rights of government employees. They sought to directly enforce the constitutional provision involved.

Issue: Whether the constitutional provision could be directly enforced.

Ruling: **NO. Under Article II of the 1987 Constitution**, declarations of principles and state policies are generally not self-executing and require implementing legislation before they may be directly enforced.

Note: This follows the wording in your source. Your earlier version said YES, but your source states that Article II provisions are generally **not self-executing**.

4. OPOSA v. FACTORAN

Facts: Children filed a case against government officials to stop logging activities that were damaging Philippine forests. They filed the case for themselves and for future generations.

Issue: Whether the constitutional right to a balanced and healthful ecology can be directly enforced.

Ruling: **YES. Under Article II, Section 16 of the 1987 Constitution**, the right to a balanced and healthful ecology is self-executing and judicially enforceable.

5. LEGASPI v. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Facts: Legaspi requested information about the civil service eligibility of government employees, but the CSC refused to provide it. He sought access to the requested government information.

Issue: Whether citizens have a constitutional right to information on matters of public concern.

Ruling: **YES. Under Article III, Section 7 of the 1987 Constitution**, citizens have the right to information on matters of public concern, subject to limitations provided by law.

6. POE-LLAMANZARES v. COMELEC

Facts: Grace Poe's citizenship and residency were questioned because she was a foundling and had lived abroad. Her qualification to run for President was challenged.

Issue: Whether Poe was a natural-born Filipino citizen and qualified to run for President.

Ruling: **YES. Under Article IV, Sections 1 and 2 and Article VII, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution**, Poe was considered a natural-born Filipino citizen and qualified to run for President.

7. AZNAR v. COMELEC

Facts: The citizenship of a candidate was questioned in an election case. The challenger presented evidence questioning the candidate's Filipino citizenship.

Issue: Whether the evidence was sufficient to prove lack of Filipino citizenship.

Ruling: **NO. Under Article IV, Section 1 of the 1987 Constitution**, the evidence presented was insufficient to establish that the candidate was not a Filipino citizen.

8. SY LIMKAICHONG v. COMELEC

Facts: Jocelyn Sy Limkaichong's citizenship was questioned because of her family background. Her qualification to hold elective office was challenged.

Issue: Whether Limkaichong was a Filipino citizen qualified to hold office.

Ruling: YES. Under Article IV, Section 1 of the 1987 Constitution, Limkaichong was considered a Filipino citizen, and there was no sufficient basis to disqualify her on citizenship grounds.

9. COQUILLA v. COMELEC

Facts: Coquilla became a U.S. citizen and later returned to the Philippines, where he was repatriated as a Filipino citizen. He then ran for Mayor and claimed that he had satisfied the required residency period.

Issue: Whether Coquilla met the one-year residency requirement to run for Mayor.

Ruling: NO. Under Article X, Section 8 of the 1987 Constitution and the Local Government Code, a candidate must meet the required residency period, and in election law, residence means domicile.

10. CO v. HRET

Facts: The citizenship of a congressional candidate was questioned because of his Chinese ancestry. His qualification to be elected was challenged.

Issue: Whether he was a Filipino citizen qualified for election.

Ruling: YES. Under Article IV, Section 1 of the 1987 Constitution, the evidence established his Philippine citizenship, making him qualified for election.

11. BENGSON v. HRET

Facts: The citizenship of a congressional candidate was questioned because he had previously become a naturalized Filipino citizen. His status as a natural-born citizen was challenged.

Issue: Whether a naturalized citizen can become a natural-born Filipino citizen.

Ruling: NO. Under Article IV, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, natural-born citizens are those who are citizens from birth without having to perform any act to acquire or perfect their Philippine citizenship.

12. **MERCADO v. MANZANO**

Facts: Eduardo Manzano had both Filipino and American citizenship. His dual citizenship was questioned in relation to his candidacy for public office.

Issue: Whether dual citizenship automatically disqualifies a person from elective office.

Ruling: NO. Under the constitutional rules on citizenship and the Local Government Code, dual citizenship is not the same as dual allegiance, and dual citizenship alone does not automatically disqualify a candidate.

13. **REPUBLIC v. SAGUN**

Facts: The government questioned the citizenship status of a person who claimed to be a Filipino citizen. His claim of Philippine citizenship was challenged.

Issue: Whether the person sufficiently established Philippine citizenship.

Ruling: YES. Under Article IV of the 1987 Constitution, Philippine citizenship is determined according to the Constitution and applicable laws.

14. **PRESCOTT v. BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION**

Facts: The petitioners questioned how immigration authorities treated their citizenship status. They challenged the use of immigration records in determining their citizenship.

Issue: Whether citizenship may be determined only from immigration records.

Ruling: NO. Under Article IV of the 1987 Constitution, citizenship is determined by the Constitution and applicable laws, not solely by immigration records.

15. **RE: VICENTE D. CHING**

Facts: Vicente Ching applied to practice law, but his Philippine citizenship was questioned. His qualification for admission to the Philippine Bar was challenged.

Issue: Whether Ching was a Filipino citizen qualified to become a lawyer.

Ruling: NO. Under the constitutional requirement on admission to the practice of law, Philippine citizenship is required for admission to the Philippine Bar.

16. CAROLINO v. SENGAL

Facts: The citizenship of the parties was questioned in relation to their legal rights. Their citizenship status was relevant to their rights under Philippine law.

Issue: Whether citizenship status can affect legal rights.

Ruling: YES. Under Article IV of the 1987 Constitution, citizenship determines the rights and qualifications that Philippine law grants to citizens.

17. DAVID v. SENATE ELECTORAL TRIBUNAL

Facts: The citizenship of a candidate elected to the Senate was questioned. His qualification to serve as Senator was challenged.

Issue: Whether the candidate was qualified to serve as Senator.

Ruling: YES. Under Article VI, Section 3 and Article IV of the 1987 Constitution, a Senator must be a natural-born Filipino citizen, and the evidence supported the candidate's citizenship.

18. VILANDO v. HRET

Facts: The citizenship and qualifications of a congressional candidate were questioned. His eligibility to hold elective office was challenged.

Issue: Whether the candidate was qualified to hold elective office.

Ruling: YES. Under Article VI, Section 6 of the 1987 Constitution, a Member of the House must be a natural-born citizen and meet the other constitutional qualifications.

19. **AKBAYAN v. COMELEC**

Facts: AKBAYAN and other party-list groups questioned COMELEC's allocation of party-list seats after the 1998 elections. They argued that COMELEC did not properly follow the rules on party-list seat allocation.

Issue: Whether COMELEC correctly allocated the party-list seats.

Ruling: NO. Under Article VI, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution and R.A. No. 7941, COMELEC must follow the constitutional and statutory rules on party-list representation and seat allocation.

20. **MACALINTAL v. COMELEC**

Facts: Macalintal questioned the constitutionality of the Overseas Absentee Voting Act. He challenged the provisions concerning overseas voting and COMELEC's implementation of the law.

Issue: Whether Congress may provide for overseas absentee voting.

Ruling: YES. Under Article V, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, Congress may provide a system for absentee voting by qualified Filipinos abroad.

21. **NICOLAS-LEWIS v. COMELEC**

Facts: A Filipino living abroad questioned the requirements for overseas voting. She challenged the conditions imposed on overseas Filipino voters.

Issue: Whether Congress may impose conditions on overseas voters.

Ruling: YES. Under Article V, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution and R.A. No. 9189, as amended by R.A. No. 10590, Congress may impose reasonable regulations on overseas voting.

22. **VELASCO v. COMELEC**

Facts: The petitioner questioned an election-related decision of COMELEC. The exercise of COMELEC's authority over the election was challenged.

Issue: Whether COMELEC properly exercised its constitutional authority.

Ruling: YES. Under Article IX-C, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, COMELEC has the constitutional authority to enforce and administer laws and regulations relative to elections.

23. IMBONG v. OCHOA

Facts: Several petitioners questioned the constitutionality of the Reproductive Health Law. They argued that the law violated constitutional rights, including religious freedom and the right to life.

Issue: Whether the Reproductive Health Law violated constitutional rights.

Ruling: PARTLY YES. Under Article III, Sections 1 and 5 and Article II, Section 12 of the 1987 Constitution, certain provisions of R.A. No. 10354 were unconstitutional, although the law as a whole was not invalidated.

24. THE SALVATION ARMY v. SSS

Facts: The Salvation Army questioned its obligation to comply with certain SSS requirements. The case involved the application of government regulations to a religious organization.

Issue: Whether religious organizations are automatically exempt from government laws.

Ruling: NO. Under Article III, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution, freedom of religion is protected, but religious organizations are not automatically exempt from generally applicable laws.

25. PERALTA v. PHILIPPINE POSTAL CORPORATION

Facts: The petitioner questioned a government action affecting constitutional rights. The government action was challenged as a possible restriction of a constitutional right.

Issue: Whether government may restrict a constitutional right through its rules or policies.

Ruling: NO. Under Article III, Section 1 of the 1987 Constitution, government regulations must comply with due process and other constitutional protections.

26. DIOCESE OF BACOLOD v. COMELEC

Facts: The Diocese of Bacolod displayed tarpaulins containing a political message about candidates and the RH Law. COMELEC ordered the tarpaulins removed because they exceeded the allowed size.

ATTY ALWAYS MENTIONED CASES

1. De Leon v. Esguerra

G.R. No. L-78059 | August 31, 1987

Facts: De Leon and the other petitioners were elected barangay officials in 1982. In February 1987, OIC Governor Esguerra designated other persons to replace them under the 1986 Provisional Constitution, but the 1987 Constitution had already been ratified on February 2, 1987.

Issue: Whether Esguerra validly designated new barangay officials after the ratification of the 1987 Constitution.

Ruling: NO. Under the 1987 Constitution, particularly Article XVIII, Section 27, the Provisional Constitution was superseded upon ratification of the 1987 Constitution. Therefore, Esguerra's designation of new barangay officials had no legal effect.

Keyword: 1987 Constitution → Provisional Constitution ended

2. Santiago v. COMELEC

G.R. No. 127325 | March 19, 1997

Facts : Miriam Defensor Santiago and others questioned COMELEC's acceptance of a people's initiative to amend the 1987 Constitution. They argued that **R.A. No. 6735 did not provide enough rules and procedures for the people to use a people's initiative to amend the Constitution.**

Issue: Whether **R.A. No. 6735 provided sufficient rules and procedures to allow the people to propose amendments to the 1987 Constitution through a people's initiative.**

Ruling: NO. Under Article XVII, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, R.A. No. 6735 was inadequate to implement people's initiative for constitutional amendments. Therefore, COMELEC could not proceed with the initiative.

Keyword: Santiago → People's initiative → Enabling law

3. Lambino v. COMELEC

G.R. No. 174153 | October 25, 2006

Facts: Lambino and others proposed to change the 1987 Constitution from a bicameral-presidential system to a unicameral-parliamentary system through people's initiative. They claimed that millions of voters supported the petition, but COMELEC denied it.

Issue: Whether the proposed changes could be made through a people's initiative as a mere amendment.

Ruling: NO. Under Article XVII, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, people's initiative may be used only for amendments, not revisions. The proposed change was a revision because it substantially changed the basic structure of government.

Keyword: Lambino → Amendment ≠ Revision

4. Hagedorn v. House of Representatives

G.R. No. 275800 | April 22, 2025

Facts: Representative Edward Hagedorn of Palawan's Third District died on October 3, 2023, leaving a vacancy. His son, Elroy Hagedorn, asked that a special election be held, but COMELEC said it needed a House resolution certifying the vacancy.

Issue: Whether COMELEC can call a special election for a vacant congressional seat without a resolution from the House of Representatives.

Ruling: YES. Under Article VI, Section 9 of the 1987 Constitution, COMELEC has the mandatory and ministerial duty to call and hold a special election when a vacancy occurs, without needing a prior House resolution.

Keyword: Hagedorn → Vacancy → COMELEC → Special election

5. Jocelyn Sy Limkaichong v. COMELEC

G.R. Nos. 178831-32 | April 1, 2009

Facts: Limkaichong ran for Representative of the First District of Negros Oriental, but her qualification was questioned because she was allegedly not a natural-born Filipino citizen. COMELEC disqualified her.

Issue: Whether Limkaichong was properly disqualified from running for Congress on the ground that she was not a natural-born citizen.

Ruling: NO. Under Article VI, Section 17 of the 1987 Constitution, once Limkaichong had been proclaimed, taken her oath, and assumed office, the HRET had jurisdiction over contests involving her election, returns, and qualifications. The Supreme Court therefore reversed her disqualification.

Issue: Whether COMELEC could order the removal of the tarpaulins.

Ruling: NO. Under Article III, Section 4 of the 1987 Constitution, political speech is protected by freedom of expression, and COMELEC could not remove the tarpaulins merely because of their size.

27. **ESTRADA v. ESCRITOR**

Facts: A court employee was accused of having a relationship outside marriage and claimed that her religious beliefs allowed the relationship. Her religious beliefs became relevant to the administrative case against her.

Issue: Whether religious freedom should be considered in determining liability.

Ruling: YES. Under Article III, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution, freedom of religion is protected and must be considered when government action affects a person's religious beliefs.

28. **AGLIPAY v. RUIZ**

Facts: The government issued postage stamps connected with an international Catholic religious event. The issuance of the stamps was questioned under the separation of Church and State.

Issue: Whether the stamps violated separation of Church and State.

Ruling: NO. Under Article III, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution, the issuance did not constitute an establishment or preference of religion because its purpose was to promote the Philippines internationally.

29. VALMORES v. ACHACOSO

Facts: The petitioners questioned a government action involving constitutional rights. They challenged the restriction imposed by the government.

Issue: Whether government may restrict a constitutional right without sufficient legal basis.

Ruling: NO. Under Article III, Section 1 of the 1987 Constitution, government action restricting constitutional rights must have sufficient legal and constitutional basis.

30. RE: LETTER OF TONY Q. VALENCIANO

Facts: A lawyer questioned the practice of holding religious activities inside a government court. The religious activities were challenged in relation to the separation of Church and State.

Issue: Whether the religious activities violated separation of Church and State.

Ruling: NO. Under Article II, Section 6 and Article III, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution, the religious activity was treated as personal religious practice and did not constitute government establishment of religion.

31. TARUC v. DE LA CRUZ

Facts: The petitioners questioned government action involving constitutional rights and the exercise of government power. The actions of government officials were challenged as being beyond their legal authority.

Issue: Whether government officials may act beyond their legal authority.

Ruling: NO. Under the Constitution and the principle of the rule of law, government officials must act within the authority granted by law and the Constitution.

32. CALALANG v. WILLIAMS

Facts: The government prohibited animal-drawn vehicles from using certain roads during specific hours to help ease traffic. The regulation was challenged in relation to equal protection and social justice.

Issue: Whether the regulation violated equal protection and social justice.

Ruling: NO. Under Article III, Section 1 of the 1987 Constitution and the police power of the State, the regulation was valid because it was reasonably related to public welfare.

33. SAN DIEGO v. DECS

Facts: Roberto San Diego failed the NMAT three times and was not allowed to take it for the fourth time. He challenged the three-flunk rule, claiming violations of his rights to education, due process, and equal protection.

Issue: Whether the three-flunk rule is a valid exercise of police power.

Ruling: YES. Under the State's police power and Article II, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution, the three-flunk rule is valid because it is reasonably related to protecting public health and maintaining competent medical professionals.

ATTY ALWAYS MENTIONED CASES

1. De Leon v. Esguerra

G.R. No. L-78059 | August 31, 1987

Facts: De Leon and the other petitioners were elected barangay officials in 1982. In February 1987, OIC Governor Esguerra designated other persons to replace them under the 1986 Provisional Constitution, but the 1987 Constitution had already been ratified on February 2, 1987.

Issue: Whether Esguerra validly designated new barangay officials after the ratification of the 1987 Constitution.

Ruling: NO. Under the 1987 Constitution, particularly Article XVIII, Section 27, the Provisional Constitution was superseded upon ratification of the 1987 Constitution. Therefore, Esguerra's designation of new barangay officials had no legal effect.

Keyword: 1987 Constitution → Provisional Constitution ended

2. Santiago v. COMELEC

G.R. No. 127325 | March 19, 1997

Facts : Miriam Defensor Santiago and others questioned COMELEC's acceptance of a people's initiative to amend the 1987 Constitution. They argued that **R.A. No. 6735 did not provide enough rules and procedures for the people to use a people's initiative to amend the Constitution.**"ò

Issue: Whether **R.A. No. 6735 provided sufficient rules and procedures to allow the people to propose amendments to the 1987 Constitution through a people's initiative.**

Ruling: NO. Under Article XVII, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, R.A. No. 6735 was inadequate to implement people's initiative for constitutional amendments. Therefore, COMELEC could not proceed with the initiative.

Keyword: Santiago → People's initiative → Enabling law

3. **Lambino v. COMELEC**

G.R. No. 174153 | October 25, 2006

Facts: Lambino and others proposed to change the 1987 Constitution from a bicameral-presidential system to a unicameral-parliamentary system through people's initiative. They claimed that millions of voters supported the petition, but COMELEC denied it.

Issue: Whether the proposed changes could be made through a people's initiative as a mere amendment.

Ruling: NO. Under Article XVII, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, people's initiative may be used only for amendments, not revisions. The proposed change was a revision because it substantially changed the basic structure of government.

Keyword: Lambino → Amendment ≠ Revision

4. **Hagedorn v. House of Representatives**

G.R. No. 275800 | April 22, 2025

Facts: Representative Edward Hagedorn of Palawan's Third District died on October 3, 2023, leaving a vacancy. His son, Elroy Hagedorn, asked that a special election be held, but COMELEC said it needed a House resolution certifying the vacancy.

Issue: Whether COMELEC can call a special election for a vacant congressional seat without a resolution from the House of Representatives.

Ruling: YES. Under Article VI, Section 9 of the 1987 Constitution, COMELEC has the mandatory and ministerial duty to call and hold a special election when a vacancy occurs, without needing a prior House resolution.

Keyword: Hagedorn → Vacancy → COMELEC → Special election

5. **Jocelyn Sy Limkaichong v. COMELEC**

G.R. Nos. 178831-32 | April 1, 2009

Facts: Limkaichong ran for Representative of the First District of Negros Oriental, but her qualification was questioned because she was allegedly not a natural-born Filipino citizen. COMELEC disqualified her.

Issue: Whether Limkaichong was properly disqualified from running for Congress on the ground that she was not a natural-born citizen.

Ruling: NO. Under Article VI, Section 17 of the 1987 Constitution, once Limkaichong had been proclaimed, taken her oath, and assumed office, the HRET had jurisdiction over contests involving her election, returns, and qualifications. The Supreme Court therefore reversed her disqualification.

Keyword: Limkaichong → Citizenship → HRET

6. **Diocese of Bacolod v. COMELEC**

G.R. No. 205728 | January 21, 2015

Facts: The Diocese of Bacolod posted tarpaulins on the walls of Bacolod Cathedral expressing a political message and identifying candidates according to their positions on the RH Law. COMELEC ordered the removal of the tarpaulins because they exceeded the allowed campaign-material size.

Issue: Whether COMELEC could order the removal of the tarpaulins based on the size restriction.

Ruling: NO. Under Article III, Section 4 of the 1987 Constitution, freedom of speech and expression protects political speech. Therefore, COMELEC's order removing the tarpaulins violated the petitioners' freedom of expression.

Keyword: Bacolod → Tarpaulin → Freedom of expression

7. AKBAYAN v. COMELEC

Facts: AKBAYAN and other party-list groups questioned COMELEC's allocation of party-list seats after the 1998 elections. They argued that COMELEC did not properly follow the rules on the 20% allocation, 2% threshold, 3-seat limit, and proportional representation.

Issue: Whether COMELEC correctly allocated the party-list seats.

Ruling: NO. Under Article VI, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution and R.A. No. 7941, COMELEC must follow the constitutional and statutory rules on party-list representation and seat allocation.

Keyword: AKBAYAN → Party-list allocation

8. Residency = Domicile

Rule: Under election law, residency and domicile are synonymous. Domicile means the person's permanent home where the person intends to return even when temporarily absent.

Keyword: Residency = Domicile = Permanent home

9. Loida Nicolas-Lewis v. COMELEC

G.R. No. 223705 | August 14, 2019

Facts: Loida Nicolas-Lewis challenged the prohibition under R.A. No. 9189, as amended by R.A. No. 10590, against partisan political activities abroad during the 30-day overseas voting period. She argued that the prohibition violated freedom of speech, expression, assembly, due process, equal protection, and territoriality.

Issue: Whether the prohibition against partisan political activities abroad during the overseas voting period was constitutional.

Ruling: YES. Under R.A. No. 9189, as amended by R.A. No. 10590, and Article V, Section 2 of the 1987 Constitution, the restriction was valid as a regulation intended to protect the integrity of overseas elections.

Keyword: Nicolas-Lewis → Overseas voting → Partisan political activity

10. SAN DIEGO v. DECS

Facts: Roberto San Diego failed the NMAT three times and was not allowed to take it for the fourth time. He challenged the three-flunk rule, claiming violations of his rights to education, due process, and equal protection.

Issue: Whether the three-flunk rule is a valid exercise of police power.

Ruling: YES. Under the State's police power and Article II, Section 5 of the 1987 Constitution, the three-flunk rule is valid because it is reasonably related to protecting public health and maintaining competent medical professionals.