United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

March 17, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

No. 20-50730 Summary Calendar

United States of America,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

RIGOBERTO AYALA-DURAN,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas USDC No. 4:20-CR-172-1

Before DAVIS, STEWART, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Rigoberto Ayala-Duran appeals his 16-month within-guidelines prison term imposed following his guilty plea for illegal reentry after removal from the United States, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326.

^{*} Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-50730

Raising a single issue on appeal, Ayala-Duran argues that under the principles articulated in *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), and *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. 99 (2013), § 1326(b) is unconstitutional because it permits a sentence above the statutory maximum in § 1326(a) based on the fact of a prior felony conviction neither alleged in the indictment nor found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. He concedes that this argument is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224, 226-27 (1998), but he seeks to preserve the issue for further review. The Government filed an unopposed motion for summary affirmance agreeing that the issue is foreclosed and, in the alternative, a motion for an extension of time to file a brief.

As the Government argues, and Ayala-Duran concedes, the sole issue raised on appeal is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres*. *See United States v. Wallace*, 759 F.3d 486, 497 (5th Cir. 2014); *United States v. Pineda-Arrellano*, 492 F.3d 624, 625-26 (5th Cir. 2007). Because the issue is foreclosed, summary affirmance is appropriate. *See Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969).

Accordingly, the Government's motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED. The Government's alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED.