United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

February 24, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 05-40917 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

PEDRO ANAYA-GOMEZ, also known as Enrique Nava-Vasquez, also known as Jose Hernandez,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 2:05-CR-128-ALL

Before GARZA, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Pedro Anaya-Gomez appeals from his guilty-plea conviction for illegal reentry into the United States. He argues that the provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) are unconstitutional in light of <u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u>, 530 U.S. 466 (2000). Anaya-Gomez's constitutional challenge is foreclosed by <u>Almendarez-Torres v.</u> <u>United States</u>, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998). Although Anaya-Gomez contends that <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule <u>Almendarez-Torres</u>

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

in light of <u>Apprendi</u>, we have repeatedly rejected such arguments on the basis that <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> remains binding. <u>See United</u> <u>States v. Garza-Lopez</u>, 410 F.3d 268, 276 (5th Cir.), <u>cert.</u> <u>denied</u>, 126 S. Ct. 298 (2005). Anaya-Gomez 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.

Accordingly, the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.