

In their Reply, petitioners submit that the Solicitor General's failure to traverse the factual matters stated by them under oath means that these matters are considered established in the absence of any factual controversy. They emphasize that prohibition lies when there is no clear, legal, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. They add that injunction is among the reliefs sought, and is undoubtedly meritorious since there are clear legal rights that are threatened by the act of respondents and the people under their control, supervision, or direction. They submitted a compact disc containing a video footage of Raymond's interview regarding their taking, detention, and escape for the Court's consideration. Lastly, they ask this Court to exercise its rule-making power under Art. VIII, Sec. 5(5) of the 1987 Constitution to promulgate rules for the protection and enforcement of human rights.

When the Rule on the Writ of Amparo (Amparo Rule) took effect on October 24, 2007, petitioners filed a Manifestation and Omnibus Motion to Treat Existing Petition as Amparo Petition, to Admit Supporting Affidavits, and to Grant Interim and Final Amparo Reliefs (Manifestation). In this Manifestation, petitioners prayed (1) that the petition be considered a Petition for the Writ of Amparo under Sec. 26 of the Amparo Rule; (2) that the Court issue the writ commanding respondents to make a verified return within the period provided by law and containing the specific matter required by law; (3) that they be granted the interim reliefs allowed by the Amparo Rule and all other reliefs prayed for but not covered by the Amparo Rule; (4) that the Court, after hearing, render judgment as required in Sec. 18; and (5) all other just and equitable reliefs.

After a close perusal of the allegations of the petition and the Comment thereon, we are treating the petition filed last August 23, 2007 as a Petition under the Amparo Rule.