United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

December 12, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

No. 05-41512 Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ESTEBAN OLIVO-RAMOS,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas USDC No. 5:05-CR-1114-ALL

Before KING, WIENER, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Esteban Olivo-Ramos (Olivo) appeals his guilty-plea conviction of, and sentence for, violating 8 U.S.C. § 1326 by being found in the United States without permission after deportation. He argues, in light of Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), that the 90-month term of imprisonment imposed in his case exceeds the statutory maximum sentence allowed for the § 1326(a) offense charged in his indictment. He challenges the constitutionality of § 1326(b)'s treatment of prior felony and aggravated felony convictions as sentencing

 $^{^{\}star}$ 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

factors rather than elements of the offense that must be found by a jury.

Olivo's constitutional challenge is foreclosed by

Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998).

Although he 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). Olivo 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.