

The Court of Appeals' Ruling

In its Decision^[23] dated May 29, 2015, the Court of Appeals affirmed. It focused on the failure of the accused to present any license agreement, lease, or permit authorizing them to log the *dita* tree. It also faulted the accused for relying on *IPRA* as the source of their alleged rights to cultural heritage and ancestral domain and lands. For they purportedly failed to substantiate their claim that they are Iraya-Mangyan IPs and the land where the *dita* tree was situated is part of their ancestral domain and lands.

Under Resolution^[24] dated April 11, 2016, the Court of Appeals denied the accused' motion for reconsideration.

Revision #1

Created 31 May 2025 06:01:19 by MaharlikanWatchman

Updated 31 May 2025 06:01:36 by MaharlikanWatchman