United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

April 21, 2004

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 03-11165 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JUAN MANUEL MUNOZ-GONZALEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas USDC No. 3:03-CR-175-ALL-M

Before JOLLY, JONES, and SMITH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURTAM:*

Juan Manuel Munoz-Gonzalez appeals the sentence imposed following his guilty plea conviction of being found in the United States after deportation/removal in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Munoz-Gonzalez complains that his sentence was improperly enhanced pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) based on a prior conviction. Munoz-Gonzalez thus contends that his sentence should not exceed the maximum term of imprisonment prescribed in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a).

 $^{^{*}}$ 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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 <u>Almendarez-Torres v. United States</u>, 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. <u>Id.</u> at 239-47. Munoz-Gonzalez acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed by <u>Almendarez-Torres</u>, but asserts that the decision has been cast into doubt by <u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u>, 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.

The Government has moved for a summary affirmance in lieu of filing an appellee's brief. In its motion, the Government asks that an appellee's brief not be required. The motion is GRANTED.

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED.