

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 01-50067  
Conference Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

OSCAR GARCIA-URBINA,  
also known as Oscar Gaica-Urbina

Defendant-Appellant.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. DR-00-CR-421-ALL  
-----

October 29, 2001

Before WIENER, BENAVIDES, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Oscar Garcia-Urbina appeals the 41-month term of imprisonment imposed following his guilty plea conviction of illegally reentering the United States after removal in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. He contends that the sentence is invalid because it exceeds the two-year maximum term of imprisonment prescribed in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a).

Garcia-Urbina complains that his sentence was improperly enhanced pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) based on his prior

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

removal following an aggravated felony conviction. He argues that the sentencing provision violates the Due Process Clause. Alternatively, Garcia-Urbina contends that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) define separate offenses. He argues that the aggravated felony conviction that resulted in his increased sentence was an element of the offense under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) that should have been alleged in his indictment. Garcia-Urbina acknowledges that his arguments are foreclosed by the Supreme Court's decision in Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), but seeks to preserve the issues for Supreme Court review in light of the decision in Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000).

Apprendi did not overrule Almendarez-Torres. See Apprendi, 530 U.S. at 489-90; United States v. Dabeit, 231 F.3d 979, 984 (5th Cir. 2000), cert. denied, 121 S. Ct. 1214 (2001). Garcia-Urbina's arguments are foreclosed. The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

The Government has moved for a summary affirmance in lieu of filing an appellee's brief. In its motion, the Government asks that the judgment of the district court be affirmed and that an appellee's brief not be required. The motion is GRANTED.

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED.