

August 17, 2005

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 04-40825  
Conference Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

PABLO MEZA BALLEZA, also known as  
Cipriano Acosta-Avalos,

Defendant-Appellant.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 1:04-CR-52-ALL  
-----

Before BENAVIDES, CLEMENT, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Pablo Meza Balleza appeals his sentence imposed following his guilty plea to illegal reentry after deportation after having been convicted of an aggravated felony. He was sentenced to 77 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release. He argues that, in light of United States v. Booker, 125 S. Ct. 738 (2005), his sentence is invalid because the district court applied the Sentencing Guidelines as if they were mandatory. We review for plain error. United States v. Mares, 402 F.3d 511,

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

513, 520-22 (5th Cir. 2005), petition for cert. filed (Mar. 31, 2005) (No. 04-9517); United States v. Valenzuela-Quevedo, 407 F.3d 728, 732-34 (5th Cir. 2005), petition for cert. filed (July 25, 2005) (No. 05-5556).

Balleza is unable to establish plain error with regard to his Booker claim because he cannot establish that being sentenced under a mandatory Guidelines scheme affected his substantial rights. The record does not indicate that the district court "would have reached a significantly different result" under a sentencing scheme in which the Guidelines were advisory only. See Mares, 402 F.3d at 520-22; Valenzuela-Quevedo, 407 F.3d at 733-34; United States v. Malveaux, 411 F.3d 558, 561 n.9 (5th Cir. 2005), petition for cert. filed (July 11, 2005) (No. 05-5297).

Balleza also asserts that the "felony" and "aggravated felony" provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b) are unconstitutional. He acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed, but he seeks to preserve the issue for possible Supreme Court review in light of Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000). This issue is foreclosed. See Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 247 (1998); United States v. Dabeit, 231 F.3d 979, 984 (5th Cir. 2000).

Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.