

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 22-50366
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

January 20, 2023

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

NOE JOSE THOMAS,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 4:21-CR-1028-1

Before JONES, HAYNES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Noe Jose Thomas appeals his guilty plea conviction and sentence for illegal reentry into the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(1). On appeal, he argues that the recidivism enhancement in § 1326(b) is unconstitutional because it permits a sentence above the otherwise-

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.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. 22-50366

applicable statutory maximum established by § 1326(a), based on facts that are neither alleged in the indictment nor found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Thomas acknowledges that this argument is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), but he seeks to preserve it for possible Supreme Court review. Accordingly, he has filed an unopposed motion for summary disposition.

We have 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). Thomas is correct that his argument is foreclosed. Because his 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 disposition is proper. *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969).

Accordingly, Thomas’s motion for summary disposition is GRANTED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.