

APPENDIX A

United States v. Medina-Rodriguez,
No. 19-50779 (5th Cir. Jan. 10, 2020)
(per curiam)

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 19-50779
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

January 10, 2020

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

EMILIO MEDINA-RODRIGUEZ,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 2:18-CR-2905-1

Before KING, DENNIS, and WILLETT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Emilio Medina-Rodriguez appeals the 37-month within-guidelines sentence and three-year term of supervised release imposed following his guilty-plea conviction for illegal reentry into the United States. He argues that the enhancement of his sentence pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b)(2), which increased the maximum sentence to 20 years of imprisonment and three years of supervised release, is unconstitutional because of the treatment of the

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

No. 19-50779

provision as a sentencing factor rather than as an element of a separate offense that must be alleged in the indictment and proved to a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. He concedes that the issue whether a sentencing enhancement under § 1326(b) must be alleged in the indictment and proved to a jury is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224 (1998). He contends, however, that subsequent Supreme Court decisions indicate that the Supreme Court may reconsider this issue, and he seeks to preserve the argument for possible Supreme Court review.

In *Almendarez-Torres*, 523 U.S. at 239-47, the Supreme Court held that for purposes of a statutory sentencing enhancement, a prior conviction is not a fact that must be alleged in an indictment or found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. We have held that subsequent Supreme Court decisions did not overrule *Almendarez-Torres*. See *United States v. Wallace*, 759 F.3d 486, 497 (5th Cir. 2014) (considering the effect of *Alleyne v. United States*, 570 U.S. 99 (2013)); *United States v. Pineda-Arrellano*, 492 F.3d 624, 625-26 (5th Cir. 2007) (considering the effect of *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000)). Thus, Medina-Rodriguez's argument is foreclosed.

Accordingly, the Government's motion for summary affirmance is GRANTED, the Government's alternative motion for an extension of time to file a brief is DENIED, and the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.

APPENDIX B

Indictment,
United States v. Medina-Rodriguez,
DR-18-CR-2905
December 19, 2018

REDACTED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DEL RIO DIVISION

FILED

2018 DEC 19 PM 12:43

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Cause No.:

v.

INDICTMENT

EMILIO MEDINA-RODRIGUEZ

[Vio: 8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) & (b)(1)/(2):
Illegal Re-entry into the United States.]

DR 18 CR 2905

THE GRAND JURY CHARGES:

COUNT ONE

[8 U.S.C. § 1326(a) & (b)(1)/(2)]

That on or about November 27, 2018, in the Western District of Texas, Defendant,

EMILIO MEDINA-RODRIGUEZ,

an alien, attempted to enter, entered, and was found in the United States having previously been denied admission, excluded, deported and removed from the United States on or about September 26, 2014, and that the Defendant had not received the consent of the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, to reapply for admission to the United States, in violation of Title 8, United States Code, Section 1326(a) and (b)(1)/(2).

A TRUE BILL.

FOREPERSON

JOHN F. BASH
United States Attorney

By:

PAUL T. HARLE

Assistant United States Attorney

APPENDIX C

8 U.S.C. § 1326



KeyCite Yellow Flag - Negative Treatment

Unconstitutional or Preempted Limitation Recognized by [United States v. Gonzalez-Fierro](#), 10th Cir.(N.M.), Feb. 04, 2020



KeyCite Yellow Flag - Negative Treatment

Proposed Legislation

United States Code Annotated
Title 8. Aliens and Nationality (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 12. Immigration and Nationality (Refs & Annos)
Subchapter II. Immigration
Part VIII. General Penalty Provisions

8 U.S.C.A. § 1326

§ 1326. Reentry of removed aliens

Effective: September 30, 1996

[Currentness](#)

(a) In general

Subject to subsection (b), any alien who--

(1) has been denied admission, excluded, deported, or removed or has departed the United States while an order of exclusion, deportation, or removal is outstanding, and thereafter

(2) enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States, unless (A) prior to his reembarkation at a place outside the United States or his application for admission from foreign contiguous territory, the Attorney General has expressly consented to such alien's reapplying for admission; or (B) with respect to an alien previously denied admission and removed, unless such alien shall establish that he was not required to obtain such advance consent under this chapter or any prior Act,

shall be fined under Title 18, or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(b) Criminal penalties for reentry of certain removed aliens

Notwithstanding subsection (a), in the case of any alien described in such subsection--

(1) whose removal was subsequent to a conviction for commission of three or more misdemeanors involving drugs, crimes against the person, or both, or a felony (other than an aggravated felony), such alien shall be fined under Title 18, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

(2) whose removal was subsequent to a conviction for commission of an aggravated felony, such alien shall be fined under such title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both;

(3) who has been excluded from the United States pursuant to [section 1225\(c\)](#) of this title because the alien was excludable under [section 1182\(a\)\(3\)\(B\)](#) of this title or who has been removed from the United States pursuant to the provisions of subchapter V, and who thereafter, without the permission of the Attorney General, enters the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under Title 18 and imprisoned for a period of 10 years, which sentence shall not run concurrently with any other sentence.¹ or

(4) who was removed from the United States pursuant to [section 1231\(a\)\(4\)\(B\)](#) of this title who thereafter, without the permission of the Attorney General, enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States (unless the Attorney General has expressly consented to such alien's reentry) shall be fined under Title 18, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

For the purposes of this subsection, the term “removal” includes any agreement in which an alien stipulates to removal during (or not during) a criminal trial under either Federal or State law.

(c) Reentry of alien deported prior to completion of term of imprisonment

Any alien deported pursuant to [section 1252\(h\)\(2\)](#)² of this title who enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time found in, the United States (unless the Attorney General has expressly consented to such alien's reentry) shall be incarcerated for the remainder of the sentence of imprisonment which was pending at the time of deportation without any reduction for parole or supervised release. Such alien shall be subject to such other penalties relating to the reentry of deported aliens as may be available under this section or any other provision of law.

(d) Limitation on collateral attack on underlying deportation order

In a criminal proceeding under this section, an alien may not challenge the validity of the deportation order described in subsection (a)(1) or subsection (b) unless the alien demonstrates that--

- (1) the alien exhausted any administrative remedies that may have been available to seek relief against the order;
- (2) the deportation proceedings at which the order was issued improperly deprived the alien of the opportunity for judicial review; and
- (3) the entry of the order was fundamentally unfair.

CREDIT(S)

(June 27, 1952, c. 477, Title II, ch. 8, § 276, 66 Stat. 229; [Pub.L. 100-690, Title VII, § 7345\(a\)](#), Nov. 18, 1988, 102 Stat. 4471; [Pub.L. 101-649, Title V, § 543\(b\)\(3\)](#), Nov. 29, 1990, 104 Stat. 5059; [Pub.L. 103-322, Title XIII, § 130001\(b\)](#), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2023; [Pub.L. 104-132, Title IV, §§ 401\(c\)](#), 438(b), 441(a), Apr. 24, 1996, 110 Stat. 1267, 1276, 1279; [Pub.L. 104-208](#), Div. C, Title III, §§ 305(b), 308(d)(4)(J), (e)(1)(K), (14)(A), 324(a), (b), Sept. 30, 1996, 110 Stat. 3009-606, 3009-618 to 3009-620, 3009-629.)