

THIRTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE REPUBLIC )  
OF THE PHILIPPINES )  
First Regular Session )

5 JUN 15 AM 11:59

SENATE

RECEIVED BY: S. B. No. 2054

---

Introduced by Senator Francis N. Pangilinan

---

## EXPLANATORY NOTE

The United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) stresses two veritable facts. First, corruption is a principal obstacle to nation building. Second, seriously addressing corruption according to international standards is determinant of a state's place in the community of progressive nations. Indeed, corruption defines in large part the political and economic hazards that spell the viability of a nation as an investment destination.

A conventional strategy in dealing with corruption, upon which the various measures proposed in the UNCAC are built, is to make corrupt practices more risky and less profitable. In this jurisdiction, this principle of deterrence can be seen in, among others, R.A. No. 1379 and Section 8, R.A. No. 3019, which prescribe forfeiture by the state of properties unlawfully acquired by public officials and employees from government service. It can be further seen in R.A. No. 7080, as amended, likewise prescribes forfeiture of the fruits of Plunder in favor of the State.

However, the present laws leave unpunished in the real sense the very acquisition and enjoyment by public officials and employees of wealth that cannot be explained through their legitimate incomes and funds. This means that those involved in unlawful enrichment in public service will simply have to conceal the very contracts and transactions that served as vehicles for the said acquisitions to avoid any real danger. They would then be merely faced with the possibility of forfeiture of wealth and dismissal from the service if caught, in what amounts to a slap on the wrist for losing in the profitable hide-and-seek game of unlawful enrichment.

In this regard, the international standard does not stop at the level of simply forfeiting substantial wealth unlawfully acquired, and punishing unlawful acquisition of wealth only if done at a grand level accompanied by a showing of each and every specific contract and transaction through which the unlawful acquisition took place.

As provided in Section 20, Chapter III of the UNCAC:

Article 20  
Illicit Enrichment

Subject to its constitution and the fundamental principles of its legal system, each State Party shall consider adopting such legislative and other measures as may be necessary to establish as a criminal

*offense, when committed intentionally, illicit enrichment, that is, a significant increase in the assets of a public official that he or she cannot reasonably explain in relation to his or her lawful income.*

There is compelling wisdom to criminalizing intentional illicit acquisition of wealth per se. As adverted to, a contrary situation – the one obtaining in this jurisdiction – makes illicit acquisition of wealth in public office a profitable and low-risk venture. For as long as the actual illegal source is concealed, a corrupt public official or employee can enjoy his unlawfully acquired wealth and assumes no danger for it greater than forfeiture of such wealth and dismissal from the service, if caught. Criminalizing intentional illicit acquisition of wealth hopefully would dramatically tip this risk-profitability balance in favor of the campaign against corruption.

Hence, the passage of this measure is earnestly sought.



FRANCIS N. PANGILINAN

THIRTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE REPUBLIC)  
OF THE PHILIPPINES )  
First Regular Session )

5 JUN 15 A11:59

SENATE

RECEIVED BY: S. B. No. 2054

---

Introduced by Senator Francis N. Pangilinan

---

AN ACT AMENDING R.A. NO. 1379, PROVIDING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR  
VIOLATION THEREOF, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines in  
Congress assembled:

Section 1. Section 2 of R.A. No. 1379 is hereby amended as follows:

"Section 2. Enrichment Through Unlawful Means. – Any public officer or  
employee who intentionally acquires wealth through unlawful means while in  
office shall suffer the following penalties:

- (a) Imprisonment for two years and one day up to four years if the  
unlawful enrichment amounts to at least One Million Pesos  
(P1,000,000.00) but not more than Two Million Five Hundred  
Thousand Pesos (P2,500,000.00);
- (b) Imprisonment for four years and one day up to six years if the unlawful  
enrichment amounts to more than Two Million Five Hundred  
Thousand Pesos (P2,500,000.00) but not more than Five Million Pesos  
(P5,000,000.00);
- (c) Imprisonment for six years and one day up to ten years if the unlawful  
enrichment amounts to more than Five Million Pesos (P5,000,000.00)  
but not more than Ten Million Pesos (P10,000,000.00);
- (d) Imprisonment for ten years and one day up to eleven years if the  
unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Ten Million Pesos  
(P10,000,000.00) but not more than Fifteen Million Pesos  
(P15,000,000.00);
- (e) Imprisonment for eleven years and one day up to twelve years if the  
unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Fifteen Million Pesos  
(P15,000,000.00) but not more than Twenty Million Pesos  
(P20,000,000.00);
- (f) Imprisonment for twelve years and one day up to thirteen years if the  
unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Twenty Million Pesos  
(P20,000,000.00) but not more than Twenty-Five Million Pesos  
(P25,000,000.00);

- (g) Imprisonment for thirteen years and one day up to fourteen years if the unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Twenty-Five Million Pesos (P25,000,000.00) but not more than Thirty Million Pesos (P30,000,000.00);
- (h) Imprisonment for fourteen years and one day up to fifteen years if the unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Thirty Million Pesos (P30,000,000.00) but not more than Thirty-Five Million Pesos (P35,000,000.00);
- (i) Imprisonment for fifteen years and one day up to sixteen years if the unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Thirty-Five Million Pesos (P35,000,000.00) but not more than Forty Million Pesos (P40,000,000.00);
- (j) Imprisonment for sixteen years and one day up to seventeen years if the unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Forty Million Pesos (P40,000,000.00) but not more than Forty-Five Million Pesos (P45,000,000.00);
- (k) Imprisonment for seventeen years and one day up to eighteen years if the unlawful enrichment amounts to more than Forty-Five Million Pesos (P45,000,000.00) but not more than Fifty Million Pesos (P50,000,000.00);

Any public officer found guilty of the act defined and punished herein shall be perpetually disqualified from holding public office.

Any property found to have been unlawfully acquired shall, in the same criminal proceedings, or in separate civil proceedings filed for the purpose, be forfeited in favor of the government.

"Section 2-a. Prima Facie Unlawful Acquisition of Wealth. – For purposes of establishing criminal and civil liabilities as defined in this Act, the failure of a public officer or employee to explain the legitimate source of an amount of property acquired by him during his incumbency which is manifestly out of proportion to his salary as such public officer or employee and to his other lawful income and the income from legitimately acquired property, shall constitute prima facie evidence of intentional acquisition of wealth in office through unlawful means. Any acquisition in excess of a public officer or employee's gross income and other funds from legitimate sources, including lawful loans and donations, within a given year, shall be deemed an increase in wealth which is manifestly out of proportion to said legitimate income and funds.

"Section 2-b. Civil Proceedings for Forfeiture. – The Solicitor General, in complaints filed with the city or provincial prosecutor where the properties involved were acquired on or before February 25, 1986, or the Office of the Ombudsman where the properties involved were acquired after February 25, 1986, after the conduct of inquiry similar to preliminary investigations in criminal cases, and upon a finding of reasonable ground to believe that there has been committed a violation of this Act and the respondent is probably guilty thereof, shall file, in the name and on behalf of the Republic of the Philippines, in the Sandiganbayan or the Regional Trial Court of the city or province where said public officer or employee resides or holds office, as the case may be, a petition for a writ commanding said officer or employee to show cause why the property

Sandiganbayan or the Regional Trial Court of the city or province where said public officer or employee resides or holds office, as the case may be, a petition for a writ commanding said officer or employee to show cause why the property aforesaid, or any part thereof, should not be declared property of the State: Provided, That no such petition shall be filed within one year before any general election or within three months before any special election.

“The resignation, dismissal or separation of the officer or employee from his office or employment in the Government or in the Government-owned or controlled corporation shall not be a bar to the filing of the petition.”

“Section 2-c. Independent Proceedings. – Notwithstanding any law or rule providing the contrary, forfeiture proceedings at the Sandiganbayan and the regular trial courts may proceed independently of, and simultaneously with, any criminal action arising from, or related, directly or indirectly, to the unlawful acquisition of wealth.”

Section 2. Section 3 of the same Act is hereby amended as follows:

“Section 3. The Petition for Forfeiture. The petition shall contain the following information:

- (a) The name and address of the respondent.
- (b) The public office or employment he holds and such other public offices or employment which he has previously held.
- (c) The approximate amount of property he has acquired during his incumbency in his past and present offices and employments.
- (d) A description of said property, or such thereof as has been identified by the Solicitor General or the Office of the Ombudsman, as the case may be.
- (e) The total amount of his government salary and other proper earnings and incomes from legitimately acquired property, and
- (f) Such other information as may enable the court to determine whether or not the respondent has unlawfully acquired property during his incumbency.”

Section 3. Section 9 of the same Act is hereby amended as follows:

“Section 9. Immunity. – The Solicitor General in complaints filed with the city or provincial prosecutor where the properties involved were acquired on or before February 25, 1986, or the Office of the Ombudsman where the properties involved were acquired after February 25, 1986, or the Office of the Ombudsman, may grant immunity from criminal prosecution to any person who testifies to the unlawful manner in which the respondent has acquired any of the property in question in cases where such testimony is necessary to prove violations of this Act.”

Section 4. Section 11 of the same Act is hereby amended as follows:

"Section 11. Prescription. – The crime punishable under this act shall prescribe in twenty (2) years. However, the laws on prescription, laches or estoppel cannot be invoked by, nor shall they benefit the respondent, in respect to any property unlawfully acquired by him and sought to be recovered by the state."

Section 5. Separability Clause. – If for any reason any provision of this Act is declared unconstitutional or invalid, such parts or portions not affected thereby shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 6. Repealing Clause. – All acts, decrees, general orders and circulars, or parts thereof inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed or modified accordingly.

Section. 7. Effectivity. – This Act shall take effect fifteen (15) days after its complete publication in at least two (2) newspaper of general circulation.

Approved,