

Appendix

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

March 10, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 21-51015
Summary Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

ERIK DANIEL SALGADO-CASTELLANO,

Defendant—Appellant,

CONSOLIDATED WITH

No. 21-51028

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff—Appellee,

versus

ERICK DANIEL SALGADO-CASTELLANOS,

Defendant—Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas

No. 21-51015

c/w No. 21-51028

USDC No. 4:21-CR-481-1

USDC No. 4:21-CR-526-1

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

PER CURIAM:*

Erik Daniel Salgado-Castellano¹ appeals the sentence imposed following his guilty plea conviction for illegal reentry after deportation, as well as the revocation of the term of supervised release he was serving at the time of the offense. He argues that 8 U.S.C. § 1326(b) is unconstitutional because it allows a sentence above the otherwise applicable statutory maximum of two years of imprisonment and one year of supervised release based on facts that are neither alleged in the indictment nor found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Because Salgado-Castellano does not address the validity of the revocation or the revocation sentence, he has abandoned any challenge to them. *See Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993).

Salgado-Castellano has filed an unopposed motion for summary disposition and a letter brief correctly conceding that the issue is foreclosed by *Almendarez-Torres v. United States*, 523 U.S. 224 (1998). *See United States v. Pervis*, 937 F.3d 546, 553-54 (5th Cir. 2019). He explains that he has raised the issue only to preserve it for possible further review. Accordingly, because summary disposition is appropriate, *see Groendyke Transp., Inc. v. Davis*, 406 F.2d 1158, 1162 (5th Cir. 1969), Salgado-Castellano's motion is GRANTED, and the district court's judgments are AFFIRMED.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

¹ The defendant-appellant's name is spelled "Erick Daniel Salgado-Castellanos" in the appeal from the revocation proceeding. We will use the spelling "Salgado-Castellano" in this opinion.

8 U.S.C. § 1326. Reentry of removed aliens

(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. 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) 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.