

October 22, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 03-50622  
Conference Calendar

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

RUFINO GONZALEZ-PALOMO, also known as Palomo  
R. Gonzales, also known as Refugio Gonzales,  
also known as Rufino Paloma, also known as Rufino  
G. Palomo, also known as Rufino Gonzalez, also known  
as Rufino Gonzales, also known as Rufino P. Gonzalez,  
also known as Miguel Angel Gonzalez, also known as  
Rufino Palomo Gonzalez, also known as Miguel Gonzales,  
also known as Rufino P. Gonzales, also known as Marino  
Gonzalez,

Defendant-Appellant.

-----  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
USDC No. SA-99-CR-433-ALL  
-----

Before KING, Chief Judge, and JOLLY and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Rufino Gonzalez-Palomo appeals the sentence imposed following  
his guilty plea conviction of being found in the United States  
after deportation/removal in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326.

Gonzalez contends that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) and 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)

---

\* 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that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent  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.

define separate offenses. He argues that the prior conviction that resulted in his increased sentence is an element of a separate offense under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) that should have been alleged in his indictment. Gonzalez maintains that he pleaded guilty to an indictment which charged only simple reentry under 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a). He argues that his sentence exceeds the maximum term of imprisonment and supervised release which may be imposed for that offense.

In Almendarez-Torres v. United States, 523 U.S. 224, 235 (1998), the Supreme Court held that the enhanced penalties in 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) are sentencing provisions, not elements of separate offenses. The Court further held that the sentencing provisions do not violate the Due Process Clause. Id. at 239-47. Gonzalez acknowledges that his argument is foreclosed by Almendarez-Torres, but asserts that the decision has been cast into doubt by Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466, 490 (2000). He seeks to preserve his argument for further review.

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). This court must follow Almendarez-Torres "unless and until the Supreme Court itself determines to overrule it." Dabeit, 231 F.3d at 984 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). 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 an appellee's brief not be required. The motion is GRANTED.

No. 03-50622

-3-

AFFIRMED; MOTION GRANTED.