United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

March 8, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 04-41459 Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

DAVID LUGO-VALOIS,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 5:04-CR-737-ALL

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, BENAVIDES, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

David Lugo-Valois (Lugo) appeals his conviction and sentence for illegal reentry following deportation. Lugo argues that the district court committed reversible error under <u>United States v.</u> <u>Booker</u>, 543 U.S. 220 (2005), by sentencing him pursuant to a mandatory application of the Sentencing Guidelines. The Government concedes that Lugo has preserved this issue for appeal. The Government, however, has not shown beyond a reasonable doubt that the error was harmless. <u>See United States</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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

<u>v. Walters</u>, 418 F.3d 461, 463-64 (5th Cir. 2005). Accordingly, Lugo's sentence is vacated, and this case is remanded for resentencing.

He also argues that the "felony" and "aggravated felony" provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(1) and (b)(2) are unconstitutional in light of <u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u>, 530 U.S. 466 (2000). Lugo's constitutional challenge is foreclosed by <u>Almendarez-Torres v. United States</u>, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998). Although Lugo 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</u>, 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). Lugo 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.

CONVICTION AFFIRMED; SENTENCE VACATED; REMANDED FOR RESENTENCING.