

FILED

October 22, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-40466
Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

TEOFILO DE JESUS PERDOMO-MARTINEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. B-02-CR-767-1

Before KING, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Teofilo De Jesus Perdomo-Martinez appeals the sentence imposed following his guilty plea conviction of being found in the United States after deportation/removal in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Perdomo-Martinez complains that his sentence was improperly enhanced pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) based on a prior conviction. He argues that the sentencing provision is unconstitutional. Perdomo-Martinez thus contends that his

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

sentence should not exceed the maximum terms of imprisonment and supervised release prescribed in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a).

In Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998), the Supreme Court held that the enhanced penalties in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) are sentencing provisions, not elements of separate offenses. The Court further held that the sentencing provisions do not violate the Due Process Clause. Id. at 239-47. Perdomo-Martinez acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres, but asserts that the decision has been cast into doubt by Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466, 490 (2000). He seeks to preserve his argument for further review.

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). This court must follow Almendarez-Torres “unless and until the Supreme Court itself determines to overrule it.” Dabeit, 231 F.3d at 984 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). 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 an appellee’s brief not be required. The motion is GRANTED.

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED.