

MAR 05 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOSE RAUL JIMENEZ-LOPEZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 09-50156

D.C. No. 3:07-CR-03345-BEN

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of California  
Roger T. Benitez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 16, 2010\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, GOULD, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Jose Raul Jimenez-Lopez appeals from the 52-month sentence imposed following his guilty-plea conviction for being a deported alien found in the United States, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1326. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

§ 1291, and we affirm.

Jimenez-Lopez contends that the district court erred when it applied a 16-level enhancement, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 2L1.2, because his prior conviction for lewd or lascivious acts with a child under 14 years of age, in violation of Cal. Penal Code § 288(a), does not qualify as a crime of violence. He contends that *Estrada-Espinoza v. Mukasey*, 546 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 2008) (en banc), overruled *United States v. Baron-Medina*, 187 F.3d 1144 (9th Cir. 1999), and *United States v. Medina-Maella*, 351 F.3d 944 (9th Cir. 2003). This contention is foreclosed by *United States v. Medina-Villa*, 567 F.3d 507, 511-16 (9th Cir. 2009).

Jimenez-Lopez contends that *Nijhawan v. Holder*, 129 S. Ct. 2294 (2009), effectively overruled *Medina-Villa*. This contention fails. *See Nijhawan*, 129 S. Ct. at 2300.

Finally, Jimenez-Lopez's contention that we must call for en banc review based on a conflict between *Estrada-Espinoza* and *Medina-Villa* is without merit. *See Pelayo-Garcia v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1010, 1013-1016 (9th Cir. 2009) (recognizing that *Estrada-Espinoza* and *Medina-Villa* set out “two different generic federal definitions of ‘sexual abuse of a minor’” and looking to both definitions to determine whether a conviction under Cal. Penal Code § 261.5(d) qualifies as the generic federal crime of “sexual abuse of a minor,” under the

categorical approach).

**AFFIRMED.**