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No. 05-41164
Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,
versus

JORGE EDUARDO HERNANDEZ-PEREZ,
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 1:05-CR-214-ALL

Before JONES, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and DAVIS, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

Jorge Eduardo Hernandez-Perez (Hernandez) appeals his conviction and sentence for attempted illegal reentry after deportation. On appeal, he challenges the constitutionality of the "felony" and "aggravated felony" provisions of 8 U.S.C. § $1326(\mathrm{~b})$, and he contends that his challenge is not barred by the appeal-waiver provision of his plea agreement. The Government seeks enforcement of the waiver provision. Because Hernandez's substantive contention is foreclosed, we need not address whether to enforce the waiver provision.

* Pursuant to 5тн 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5тн CIR. R. 47.5.4.
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The constitutional issue raised by Hernandez is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998).

Although Hernandez contends that Almendarez-Torres was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule Almendarez-Torres in light of Apprendi V. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), we have repeatedly rejected such arguments on the basis that Almendarez-Torres remains binding. See United States v. Garza-Lopez, 410 F.3d 268, 276 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 298 (2005). Hernandez properly concedes that his argument is foreclosed in light of Almendarez-Torres and circuit precedent, but he raises it here to preserve it for further review.

The district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.

