

August 20, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-41184
Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

GABRIEL ASTORGA-RAMIREZ,
also known as Ramiro Ruiz Ramirez,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. L-02-CR-332-ALL

Before JONES, WIENER, and BENAVIDES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Gabriel Astorga-Ramirez appeals his guilty-plea conviction and sentence for violating 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(2) by entering the United States, without permission, following both his conviction for an aggravated felony and subsequent deportation.

For the first time on appeal, Astorga-Ramirez argues that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) is unconstitutional because it treats a prior conviction for a felony or aggravated felony as a sentencing

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

factor and not as an element of the offense. He asks us to vacate his conviction and sentence, reform the judgment to reflect a conviction only under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a), and remand his case for resentencing.

In Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998), the Supreme Court held that the enhanced penalties in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) are sentencing provisions, not elements of separate offenses. The Court further held that the sentencing provisions do not violate the Due Process Clause. Id. at 239-47. Astorga-Ramirez acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres, but asserts that the decision has been cast into doubt by Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466, 490 (2000). He seeks to preserve his argument for further review.

Apprendi did not overrule Almendarez-Torres. See Apprendi, 530 U.S. at 489-90; United States v. Dabeit, 231 F.3d 979, 984 (5th Cir. 2000). This court must follow Almendarez-Torres "unless and until the Supreme Court itself determines to overrule it." Dabeit, 231 F.3d at 984 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

AFFIRMED.