

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

November 23, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 21-50551  
Summary Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff—Appellee,*

*versus*

INOCENCIO GAMBOA-RIVERA,

*Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. 4:20-CR-589-1

---

Before SMITH, STEWART, and GRAVES, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Inocencio Gamboa-Rivera appeals his sentence of 27 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release, which the district court imposed following his guilty plea conviction for entry after deportation in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. He contends that the enhancement of his

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.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. 21-50551

sentence under § 1326(b)(2) based on his prior conviction for an aggravated felony increased the statutory maximum terms of imprisonment and supervised release. He maintains that the enhancement is unconstitutional because his prior conviction is treated as a sentencing factor rather than an element of the offense that must be alleged in the indictment and found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Gamboa-Rivera concedes that the issue is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), but he seeks to preserve the issue for further review. The Government moves for summary affirmance, asserting that this issue is foreclosed.

The parties are correct that Gamboa-Rivera's assertion is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres*. See *United States v. Wallace*, 759 F.3d 486, 497 (5th Cir. 2014); *United States v. Pineda-Arrellano*, 492 F.3d 624, 625-26 (5th Cir. 2007). Accordingly, the Government's motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, see *Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969); its alternative motion for an extension of time to file an appellate brief is DENIED; and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.