

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 19-50120  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit  
**FILED**  
September 19, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

RUBEN MENDEZ,

Defendant-Appellant

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 2:18-CR-25-1

---

Before KING, GRAVES, and WILLETT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Ruben Mendez appeals the 84-month, within-guidelines sentence and three-year term of supervised release imposed following his guilty-plea conviction for illegal reentry into the United States. He argues that the enhancement of his sentence under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(1), which increased the maximum term of imprisonment to 10 years, is unconstitutional because the provision is treated as a sentencing factor rather than as an element of 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

## No. 19-50120

separate offense that must be proved to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. He concedes that the issue whether a sentencing enhancement under § 1326(b) must be alleged in the indictment and proved to a jury is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224 (1998). However, he seeks to preserve the issue for possible Supreme Court review because, he argues, subsequent Supreme Court decisions indicate that the Court may reconsider this issue.

In *Almendarez-Torres*, 523 U.S. at 239-47, the Supreme Court held that for purposes of a statutory sentencing enhancement, a prior conviction is not a fact that must be alleged in an indictment or found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. This court has held that subsequent Supreme Court decisions did not overrule *Almendarez-Torres*. See *United States v. Wallace*, 759 F.3d 486, 497 (5th Cir. 2014) (considering the effect of *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. 99 (2013)); *United States v. Pineda-Arellano*, 492 F.3d 624, 625-26 (5th Cir. 2007) (considering the effect of *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000)). Thus, Mendez's argument is foreclosed.

Accordingly, the Government's motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, the Government's alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.