IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-50589 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ELIAS LIRA-ESPINOZA,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas USDC No. EP-01-CR-552-ALL-DB October 29, 2001

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

Elias Lira-Espinoza appeals the 70-month term of imprisonment imposed following his guilty plea conviction of being found in the United States after removal in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Lira-Espinoza contends that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) define separate offenses. He argues that the aggravated felony conviction that resulted in his increased sentence was an element of the offense under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) that should have been alleged in his indictment. Lira-Espinoza notes that he pleaded guilty to an indictment which

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

recited only facts and elements supporting a charge of simple reentry under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a), and argues that his sentence exceeds the two-year maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for that offense. Lira-Espinoza acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed by the Supreme Court's decision in <u>Almendarez-Torres v. United States</u>, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), but seeks to preserve the issue for Supreme Court review in light of the decision in <u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u>, 530 U.S. 466 (2000).

<u>Apprendi</u> did not overrule <u>Almendarez-Torres</u>. <u>See Apprendi</u>, 530 U.S. at 489-90; <u>United States v. Dabeit</u>, 231 F.3d 979, 984 (5th Cir. 2000), <u>cert. denied</u>, 121 S. Ct. 1214 (2001). Lira-Espinoza's argument is foreclosed. 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.

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED.