United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 23, 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

No. 03-41320 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

MANUEL DAMIAN-GARCIA,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. L-03-CR-774-ALL

Before BARKSDALE, DeMOSS, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.
PER CURTAM:*

Manuel Damian-Garcia pleaded guilty to one count of illegal reentry into the United States, and the district court sentenced him to 36 months in prison and a three-year term of supervised release. Damian-Garcia argues that the district court erred by characterizing his state felony conviction for simple possession of cocaine as an "aggravated felony" for purposes of U.S.S.G. § 2L1.2(b)(1)(C), when that same offense is punishable only as a misdemeanor under federal law. This issue, however, is

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

foreclosed by our precedent. <u>See United States v. Caicedo-Cuero</u>, 312 F.3d 697, 706-11 (5th Cir. 2002), <u>cert. denied</u>, 538 U.S. 1021 (2003); <u>United States v. Hinojosa-Lopez</u>, 130 F.3d 691, 693-94 (5th Cir. 1997). Damian-Garcia has not shown that the district court erred by characterizing his state conviction as an aggravated felony for U.S.S.G. § 2L1.2(b)(1)(C) purposes and by sentencing him accordingly.

Damian-Garcia argues that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) is unconstitutional on its face and as applied in his case because it does not require the fact of a prior felony or aggravated felony conviction to be charged in the indictment and proved beyond a reasonable doubt. This argument is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224 (1998). See United States v. Dabeit, 231 F.3d 979, 984 (5th Cir. 2000).

Damian-Garcia has shown no error in the district court's judgment. Accordingly, that judgment is AFFIRMED.