United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

August 28, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 06-40062 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

MIGUEL SANCHEZ-AGUILERA, also known as Jimmy Robles,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 1:05-CR-611-ALL

Before DAVIS, SMITH, and WIENER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURTAM:*

Miguel Sanchez-Aguilera (Sanchez) appeals his conviction and 33-month sentence for illegal reentry following deportation. He argues that the "felony" and "aggravated felony" provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(1) and (2) are unconstitutional in light of Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000). Sanchez contends that his plea agreement, which contained a waiver-of-appeal provision, does not bar this appeal because he is challenging the constitutionality of the statute of conviction and his sentence

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

is in excess of the statutory maximum. The Government seeks to enforce the appeal waiver. We assume, <u>arguendo</u> only, that the waiver does not bar the instant appeal.

Sanchez's constitutional challenge is foreclosed by

Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998).

Although Sanchez contends that Almendarez-Torres was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule Almendarez-Torres in light of Apprendi, 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). Sanchez 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. Because Sanchez has shown no error in the judgment of the district court, that judgment is AFFIRMED.