

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 22-50623  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit  
**FILED**  
December 28, 2022  
Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

JOSE ANGEL BONILLA-PINEDA,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:22-CR-89-1

---

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, GRAVES, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Jose Angel Bonilla-Pineda appeals his conviction and sentence for illegal reentry into the United States under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and (b)(1). For the first time on appeal, Bonilla-Pineda contends that the recidivism enhancement in § 1326(b) is unconstitutional because it permits a sentence above the otherwise-applicable statutory maximum established by § 1326(a),

---

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

No. 22-50623

based on facts that are neither alleged in the indictment nor found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. While Bonilla-Pineda 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. In addition, Bonilla-Pineda has filed an unopposed motion for summary disposition.

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). Thus, Bonilla-Pineda is correct that his argument is foreclosed, and summary disposition is appropriate. See *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969).

Bonilla-Pineda's motion is GRANTED, and the district court's judgment is AFFIRMED.