Supreme Court E-Library

EN BANC

[G.R. No. L-35992. February 25, 1975]

LEONOR S. LITTON and ROGELIO M. PAZ, *petitioners, vs.* **HON. B. JOSE CASTILLO, Provincial Fiscal of Rizal, HON. VICENTE ABAD SANTOS, in his capacity as Secretary of Justice, and GEORGE LITTON, Sr.,** *respondents.*

SYLLABUS

REMEDIAL LAW; CRIMINAL PROCEDURE; PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION; UNIFORM SYSTEM OF PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION. — Presidential Decree No. 77, issued by the President of the Republic of the Philippines on December 6, 1972, and General Order No. 1 dated September 22, 1972, amending Section 1 of Republic Act No. 5180 (Prescribing a Uniform System of Preliminary Investigation by Provincial and City Fiscals and their Assistants and by State Attorneys or their Assistants), forms part of the law of the land (Article XVII, Section 3[2] of the New Constitution).

R E S O L U T I O N

ANTONIO, *J.:*

Considering that Presidential Decree No. 77 issued by the President of the Republic of the Philippines on December 6, 1972 pursuant to Proclamation No. 1081 dated September 21, 1972, and General Order No. 1 dated September 22, 1972, amending Section 1 of Republic Act No. 5180 (Prescribing a Uniform System of Preliminary Investigation by Provincial and City Fiscals and their Assistants and by State Attorneys or their Assistants), the validity of which is being questioned in the present petition for *certiorari*, prohibition and *mandamus*, now forms part of the law of the land (Article XVII, Section 3[2] of the new Constitution), the Court Resolved to DENY the petition for lack of merit.

Supreme Court E-Library

Makalintal, C.J., Barredo, Makasiar, Esguerra, Fernandez, and *Aquino, JJ.,* concur.

Castro and *Teehankee, JJ.*, in the result.

Fernando, J., concurs on the ground of its presumptive validity

Muñoz Palma, J., took no part.

SECOND DIVISION

[G.R. No. L-36949. February 25, 1975]

BIBIANO M. VIÑA, and ANUNCIACION REYNOSO, *petitioners, vs.* **PASTOR BRAVO and HON. COURT OF APPEALS,** *respondents.*

SYLLABUS

CIVIL LAW; COMPROMISE AGREEMENT; JUDGMENT BASED ON COMPROMISE; PARTIES BOUND BY ITS TERMS. — A compromise agreement duly approved by the court constitutes a judgment and the parties are bound to comply the terms thereof.

R E S O L U T I O N

FERNANDEZ, *J.:*

The parties have submitted to this Court the following:

"COMPROMISE AGREEMENT

"At the hearing here this morning before the Honorable Justices of the Second Division of the Supreme Court a definite compromise agreement had been arrived at, as follows: