

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 21-51090  
CONSOLIDATED WITH  
No. 21-51093  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

March 30, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

DANIEL GALLEGOS-QUIRINO,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:21-CR-837-1  
USDC No. 4:21-CR-540-1

---

Before WIENER, DENNIS, and HAYNES, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Daniel Gallegos-Quirino appeals his conviction for illegal reentry after removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(2), along with the revocation of 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\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.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. 21-51090 c/w

No. 21-51093

term of supervised release he was serving at the time of the offense. Because his appellate letter brief does not address the validity of the revocation or the revocation sentence, he abandons any challenge to that judgment. *See Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993).

For the first time on appeal, Gallegos-Quirino contends that it violates the Constitution to treat a prior conviction that increases the statutory maximum under § 1326(b) as a sentencing factor, rather than as an element of the offense. He 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 Gallegos-Quirino 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 AS MOOT.