

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

May 13, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 21-11067  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

CARLOS VAZQUEZ-TELLEZ,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:19-591-1

---

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

PER CURIAM:\*

Carlos Vazquez-Tellez appeals his conviction and 44-month within-guidelines sentence for illegal reentry after having been previously removed, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(1). He argues that it violates his constitutional due process rights to treat a prior conviction that increases the

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.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. 21-11067

statutory maximum under § 1326(b) as a sentencing factor, rather than as an element of the offense.

Vazquez-Tellez correctly concedes that the argument is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), but he wishes to preserve it for further review. The Government has moved without opposition for summary affirmance or, alternatively, for an extension of time to file its brief.

As the Government asserts and as Vazquez-Tellez concedes, the sole issue raised on appeal is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres*. See *United States v. Pervis*, 937 F.3d 546, 553-54 (5th Cir. 2019); *United States v. Wallace*, 759 F.3d 486, 497 (5th Cir. 2014). 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,” *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969), summary affirmance is proper.

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.