United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

April 11, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 05-41040 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

JOSE ANTONIO ANDRADE,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 1:05-CR-56-ALL

Before JONES, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and DAVIS, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

Jose Antonio Andrade was convicted of being unlawfully present in the United States following a prior deportation. He was sentenced to 63 months of imprisonment and a three-year term of supervised release. The Government seeks enforcement of the waiver provisions in Andrade's plea agreement. We need not decide the applicability of the waiver provisions in this case because the issue that Andrade raises is foreclosed.

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

In his sole issue on appeal, Andrade renews his argument that 8 U.S.C. § 1326 is facially unconstitutional because it treats prior felony and aggravated felony convictions as sentencing factors rather than elements of the offense that must be found by a jury in light of <u>Apprendi v. New Jersey</u>, 530 U.S. 466 (2000).

Andrade's constitutional challenge is foreclosed by <u>Almendarez-Torres v. United States</u>, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998). Although Andrade contends that <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> in light of <u>Apprendi</u>, we have repeatedly rejected such arguments on the basis that <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> remains binding. <u>See United States v. Garza-Lopez</u>, 410 F.3d 268, 276 (5th Cir.), <u>cert. denied</u>, 126 S. Ct. 298 (2005). Andrade properly concedes that his argument is foreclosed in light of <u>Almendarez-Torres</u> and circuit precedent, but he raises it here to preserve it for further review.

AFFIRMED.