

# United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 24-50592  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

March 10, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

PEDRO QUINTANA-OJEDA,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 2:24-CR-259-1

---

Before SMITH, STEWART, and DUNCAN, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:\*

Pedro Quintana-Ojeda appeals his conviction and sentence for illegal reentry into the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1326. For the first time on appeal, he argues that the recidivism enhancement in § 1326(b) is unconstitutional because it permits a sentence above the otherwise-applicable statutory maximum established by § 1326(a), based on facts that

---

\* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 24-50592

are neither alleged in the indictment nor found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. While Quintana-Ojeda acknowledges this argument is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), he nevertheless seeks to preserve it for possible Supreme Court review. The Government has moved without opposition for summary affirmance or, alternatively, for an extension of time to file its brief.

This court has held that subsequent Supreme Court decisions such as *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. 99 (2013), and *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), did not overrule *Almendarez-Torres*. See *United States v. Pervis*, 937 F.3d 546, 553-54 (5th Cir. 2019); see also *Erlinger v. United States*, 602 U.S. 821, 838 (2024) (explaining that *Almendarez-Torres* “persists as a narrow exception permitting judges to find only the fact of a prior conviction” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)). Thus, Quintana-Ojeda is correct that his argument is foreclosed. Because the Government’s position “is clearly right as a matter of law so that there can be no substantial question as to the outcome of the case,” summary affirmance is appropriate. *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969).

Accordingly, the 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 is DENIED.