

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-50187
Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ESTHER SALAZAR-DE LICON,
also known as Esther Licon,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. EP-01-CR-1469-ALL-DB

August 21, 2002

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, DAVIS, and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Esther Salazar-De Licon appeals the sentence imposed following her guilty plea conviction of being found in the United States after deportation in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. She contends that the sentence is invalid because it exceeds the two-year maximum term of imprisonment prescribed in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a). Salazar-De Licon complains that her sentence was improperly enhanced pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) based on her prior deportation following an aggravated felony conviction.

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

She argues that the sentencing provision violates the Due Process Clause. Alternatively, Salazar-De Licon contends that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) define separate offenses. She argues that the aggravated felony conviction that resulted in her increased sentence was an element of the offense under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) that should have been alleged in her indictment.

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. Salazar-De Licon acknowledges that her arguments are 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). She seeks to preserve her arguments 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), cert. denied, 531 U.S. 1202 (2001). 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). The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

The Government has moved for a summary affirmance in lieu of filing an appellee's brief. In its motion, the Government asks that the judgment of the district court be affirmed and that an appellee's brief not be required. The motion is GRANTED.

No. 02-50187
-3-

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED.