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## Defendant-Appellant.

for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 7:22-CR-114-1

Before Higginbotham, Graves, and Ho, Circuit Judges.

## Per Curiam:*

Fernando Hernandez-Cordova appeals the sentence imposed after his guilty plea conviction for illegal reentry subsequent to removal, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(1). Hernandez-Cordova contends, for the first time on appeal, that it violates the Constitution to treat a prior conviction that increases the statutory maximum under $\S 1326(\mathrm{~b})$ as a sentencing factor,

[^0]rather than as an element of the offense. Hernandez-Cordova concedes that this issue is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), but he seeks to preserve the issue for future review. In addition, he has filed an unopposed motion for summary disposition.

As Hernandez-Cordova concedes, the sole issue raised on appeal is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres. See United States v. Pervis, 937 F.3d 546, 553-54 (5th Cir. 2019); United States v. Wallace, 759 F.3d 486, 497 (5th Cir. 2014). Because his position "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), summary disposition is proper. Accordingly, Hernandez-Cordova's motion is GRANTED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.


[^0]:    *This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH Cir. R. 47.5.

