United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

## FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

October 22, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 02-41577 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JUAN MARTIN MEDRANO CANTU, also known as Juan Manuel Lopez, also known as Juan Moreno Garcia, also known as Juan Martin Campos-Cantu,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. B-02-CR-43-ALL

\_\_\_\_\_

Before KING, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and STEWART, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM:\*

Juan Martin Medrano Cantu appeals the sentence imposed following his guilty plea conviction of being found in the United States after deportation in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Cantu argues that the "felony" and "aggravated felony" provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(1) and (2) are unconstitutional.

 $<sup>^{*}</sup>$  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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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 Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998), the Supreme Court held that the enhanced penalties in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) are sentencing provisions, not elements of separate offenses. The Court further held that the sentencing provisions do not violate the Due Process Clause. Id. at 239-47. Cantu acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998), but asserts that the decision has been cast into doubt by Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466, 490 (2000). He seeks to preserve his argument for further review.

Apprendi did not overrule Almendarez-Torres. See Apprendi,
530 U.S. at 489-90; United States v. Dabeit, 231 F.3d 979, 984

(5th Cir. 2000). This court must follow Almendarez-Torres

"unless and until the Supreme Court itself determines to overrule
it." Dabeit, 231 F.3d at 984 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). The judgment of the district court is

AFFIRMED.