

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

October 12, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 20-20012  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

SAUL ZAMORA DE ANDA,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:19-CR-248-1

---

Before DAVIS, STEWART, and DENNIS, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Saul Zamora De Anda appeals his conviction under 8 U.S.C. § 1326 for unlawful presence in the United States. Citing *Pereira v. Sessions*, 138 S. Ct. 2105 (2018), he contends that his prior removal does not satisfy the removal element of § 1326 because the notice to appear did not state the date

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-20012

or time of the removal hearing. In *United States v. Pedroza-Rocha*, 933 F.3d 490, 497-98 (5th Cir. 2019), *cert. denied*, 2020 WL 2515686 (U.S. May 18, 2020) (No. 19-6588), we relied on *Pierre-Paul v. Barr*, 930 F.3d 684, 688-89 (5th Cir. 2019), *cert. denied*, 2020 WL 1978950 (U.S. Apr. 27, 2020) (No. 19-779), to conclude that (1) a notice to appear that lacked the date and time of the removal hearing was not defective, (2) any defect was cured by the subsequent service of a notice of hearing, and (3) the purported defect was not jurisdictional. Additionally, we held that the defendant could not collaterally attack the notice to appear without first exhausting administrative remedies. *Pedroza-Rocha*, 933 F.3d at 498. Conceding that *Pedroza-Rocha* and *Pierre-Paul* foreclose his claim, Zamora De Anda raises it to preserve it for further review.

The Government has filed an unopposed motion for summary affirmance, which is proper if “the position of one of the parties is clearly right as a matter of law so that there can be no substantial question as to the outcome of the case.” *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969). Because Zamora De Anda correctly concedes that his claim is foreclosed by *Pierre-Paul* and *Pedroza-Rocha*, the motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, the Government’s alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED as moot, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.