

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-50047
Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ULISES HERNANDEZ-LAZO,
also known as Ulises Hernandez,
also known as Ulises Lazo,
also known as Ulises Lazo Hernandez,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. SA-99-CR-195-ALL-HFG

October 29, 2001

Before WIENER, BENAVIDES, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Ulises Hernandez-Lazo challenges as unconstitutional the 70-month term of imprisonment imposed following his guilty plea conviction of being found in the United States after removal in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Hernandez-Lazo contends that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) define separate offenses. He argues that the aggravated felony conviction that resulted in his increased sentence was an element of the offense

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2) that should have been alleged in his indictment. Hernandez-Lazo notes that he pleaded guilty to an indictment which recited only facts and elements supporting a charge of simple reentry under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a), and argues that his sentence exceeds the two-year maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for that offense. Hernandez-Lazo acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed by the Supreme Court's decision in Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224 (1998), but seeks to preserve the issue for Supreme Court review in light of the decision in Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000).

Apprendi did not overrule Almendarez-Torres. See Apprendi, 530 U.S. at 489-90; United States v. Dabeit, 231 F.3d 979, 984 (5th Cir. 2000), cert. denied, 121 S. Ct. 1214 (2001). Hernandez-Lazo's argument is foreclosed. The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

The Government has moved for a summary affirmance in lieu of filing an appellee's brief. In its motion, the Government asks that the judgment of the district court be affirmed and that an appellee's brief not be required. The motion is GRANTED.

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED.