

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit**FILED**

February 23, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
ClerkIN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-40518  
Conference Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

RAMIRO PEREZ-BARRIENTOS,

Defendant-Appellant.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
USDC No. 7:04-CR-750-ALL  
-----

Before GARZA, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Ramiro Perez-Barrientos (Perez) appeals his conviction and sentence following his guilty plea to being found in the United States after a previous deportation.

Perez argues for the first time on appeal that the district court abused its discretion when it imposed a condition of supervised release that requires him to cooperate in the collection of his DNA. Perez's claim is not ripe for review.

See United States v. Riascos-Cuenu, 428 F.3d 1100, 1101-02 (5th

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

Cir. 2005), petition for cert. filed (Jan. 9, 2006) (No. 05-8662). Therefore, this court lacks jurisdiction to review this claim, and this portion of the appeal is dismissed.

Additionally, Perez's constitutional challenge to 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998). Although Perez contends that Almendarez-Torres was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule Almendarez-Torres in light of Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), we have repeatedly rejected such arguments on the basis that Almendarez-Torres remains binding. See United States v. Garza-Lopez, 410 F.3d 268, 276 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 126 S. Ct. 298 (2005). Perez properly concedes that his argument is foreclosed in light of Almendarez-Torres and circuit precedent, but he raises it here to preserve it for further review.

JUDGMENT AFFIRMED; APPEAL DISMISSED IN PART.