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**FACTS**

\* \*\*Who:\*\* Local governments in Metro Manila (Navotas City, City of Manila, Quezon City)  
\* \*\*What:\*\* Implemented curfew ordinances for minors through police operations called "Oplan Rody."  
\* \*\*When:\*\* Following President Rodrigo Roa Duterte's campaign for a nationwide curfew.  
 \* Navotas Ordinance: August 26, 1999, amended June 6, 2002  
 \* Manila Ordinance: October 14, 2002, curfew hours 10:00 PM to 4:00 AM  
 \* Quezon City Ordinance: July 31, 2014, curfew hours 10:00 PM to 5:00 AM  
\* \*\*Where:\*\* Metro Manila (Navotas City, City of Manila, Quezon City)  
\* \*\*Who:\*\* Samahan ng mga Progresibong Kabataan (SPARK) (an association of young adults and minors)  
\* \*\*What:\*\* Filed a petition challenging the constitutionality of the curfew ordinances.  
\* \*\*Why:\*\* SPARK claimed the curfew ordinances (a) result in arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement, (b) suffer from overbreadth by proscribing or impairing legitimate activities of minors during curfew hours; (c) deprive minors of the right to liberty and the right to travel without substantive due process; and (d) deprive parents of their natural and primary right in rearing the youth without substantive due process.  
\* \*\*What:\*\* SPARK claimed the Manila Ordinance contravenes RA 9344, as amended by RA 10630.

**ISSUES**

Based on the provided text, the central legal issue the court formally addressed and resolved is:  
  
\* \*\*Substantive Matter:\*\* The constitutionality of the Curfew Ordinances.

**RULINGS**

Okay, here's the breakdown of the legal issues, the Court's resolution, final ruling, and dispositive portion of the decision based on the provided text:  
  
\*\*Legal Issues and Resolutions:\*\*  
  
1. \*\*Constitutionality of Curfew Ordinances (Manila, Navotas, Quezon City):\*\* Whether the local curfew ordinances infringe upon the constitutional rights of minors, particularly their right to liberty, freedom of movement, and other fundamental rights.  
  
 \* \*\*Resolution:\*\* The Court applied the strict scrutiny test. All three ordinances were found to have a compelling state interest (juvenile safety and crime prevention). However, only the Quezon City ordinance was found to be narrowly tailored and to use the least restrictive means to achieve that interest, providing adequate exceptions for minors to exercise their rights.  
 \* \*\*Holding:\*\*  
 \* The Manila and Navotas ordinances are unconstitutional because they are not narrowly tailored.  
 \* The Quezon City ordinance is constitutional because it is narrowly tailored and provides sufficient exceptions.  
 \* The Court construed Section 4(a) of the Quezon City Ordinance to include parental permission as a constructive form of accompaniment and hence, an allowable exception to the curfew measure.  
2. \*\*Validity of Penal Provisions in Manila Ordinance:\*\* Whether the penal provisions (reprimands, fines, and imprisonment for minors) in the Manila Ordinance are consistent with Section 57-A of RA 9344 (as amended), the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act.  
  
 \* \*\*Resolution:\*\* The Court found that the penal provisions of the Manila Ordinance conflicted with Section 57-A of RA 9344, as amended.  
 \* \*\*Holding:\*\* The penal provisions in the Manila ordinance imposing reprimand and fines/imprisonment on minors are invalid because they conflict with the law.  
  
\*\*Dispositive Portion:\*\*  
  
"WHEREFORE, the petition is PARTLY GRANTED. The Court hereby declares Ordinance No. 8046, issued by the local government of the City of Manila, and Pambayang Ordinansa Blg. No. 99-02, as amended by Pambayang Ordinansa Blg. 2002-13 issued by the local government of Navotas City, UNCONSTITUTIONAL and, thus, NULL and VOID; while Ordinance No. SP-2301, Series of 2014, issued by the local government of the Quezon City is declared CONSTITUTIONAL and, thus, VALID in accordance with this Decision.  
  
SO ORDERED."