USA v. Banegas-Hernandez

Doc. 920060223

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

February 23, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 05-40597 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ANTONIO BANEGAS-HERNANDEZ,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 1:04-CR-983-ALL

\_\_\_\_\_

-----

Before GARZA, DENNIS, and PRADO, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Antonio Banegas-Hernandez appeals his guilty-plea conviction and sentence for unlawful presence in the United States following deportation. He argues that the "felony" and "aggravated felony" provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(1) and (2) are unconstitutional in light of Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000). We need not decide the applicability of the plea-agreement waivers in this case because the issue that Banegas-Hernandez raises is foreclosed.

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

Banegas-Hernandez's constitutional challenge is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998). Although Banegas-Hernandez contends that Almendarez-Torres was incorrectly decided and that a majority of the Supreme Court would overrule Almendarez-Torres in light of Apprendi, 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). Banegas-Hernandez 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.

AFFIRMED.