United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

February 23, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 05-40169 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

LUIS MANUEL HERNANDEZ-GONZALEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 5:04-CR-1418-ALL

Before GARZA, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Luis Manuel Hernandez-Gonzalez (Hernandez) pleaded guilty without the benefit of a plea agreement to reentry into the United States following deportation. <u>See</u> 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a), (b).

Hernandez argues for the first time on appeal that the district court erred in ordering him to cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample as a condition of supervised release and that this condition should therefore be vacated. Hernandez's

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

claim is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because it is not ripe for review. <u>See United States v. Riascos-Cuenu</u>, 428 F.3d 1100, 1102 (5th Cir. 2005), <u>petition for cert. filed</u> (Jan. 9, 2006) (No. 05-8662).

Hernandez also challenges the constitutionality of § 1326(b). His constitutional challenge is foreclosed by <u>Almendarez-Torres v. United States</u>, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998). Although Hernandez contends that <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> in light of <u>Apprendi v. New</u> <u>Jersey</u>, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), we have repeatedly rejected such arguments on the basis that <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> remains binding. <u>See United States v. Garza-Lopez</u>, 410 F.3d 268, 276 (5th Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u>, 126 S. Ct. 298 (2005). Hernandez properly concedes that his argument is foreclosed in light of <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> and circuit precedent, but he raises it here to preserve it for further review.

JUDGMENT AFFIRMED; APPEAL DISMISSED IN PART.