

February 23, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-40444  
Conference Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JOSE RENE GARCIA-HERNANDEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 5:04-CR-2188-ALL  
-----

Before GARZA, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Jose Rene Garcia-Hernandez (Garcia) pleaded guilty to illegal reentry after deportation and was sentenced to 70 months of imprisonment and a three-year term of supervised release.

Garcia argues for the first time on appeal that the district court erred in ordering him to cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample as a condition of supervised release and that this condition should therefore be vacated. This claim is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because it is not ripe for review. See

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

United States v. Riascos-Cuenu, 428 F.3d 1100, 1102 (5th Cir. 2005), petition for cert. filed (Jan. 9, 2006) (No. 05-8662).

Also for the first time on appeal, Garcia challenges the constitutionality of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b). His constitutional challenge is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998). Although Garcia contends that Almendarez-Torres was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule Almendarez-Torres in light of Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), we have repeatedly rejected such arguments on the basis that Almendarez-Torres remains binding. See United States v. Garza-Lopez, 410 F.3d 268, 276 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 298 (2005). Garcia properly concedes that his argument is foreclosed in light of Almendarez-Torres and circuit precedent, but he raises it here to preserve it for further review.

JUDGMENT AFFIRMED; APPEAL DISMISSED IN PART.