

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6296

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILLIAM DAVID LOCKLAIR, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (4:11-cr-02079-TLW-1)

Submitted: August 23, 2016

Decided: August 29, 2016

Before DUNCAN, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William David Locklair, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Arthur Bradley Parham, Assistant United States Attorney, Florence, South Carolina, Stanley D. Ragsdale, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William David Locklair, Jr., appeals from the district court's order granting him a sentence reduction from 192 to 180 months' imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (2012). Locklair argues on appeal that the district court erred by failing to reduce his sentence to 155 months' imprisonment, a sentence near the bottom of the amended Sentencing Guidelines range resulting from application of Amendment 782.*

The district court, however, was not required to impose such a sentence. See United States v. Stewart, 595 F.3d 197, 200 (4th Cir. 2010) ("[T]he decision about whether to reduce a sentence [under § 3582(c)(2)] is discretionary on the part of the district court. The court is not required to reduce a defendant's sentence, even where the current sentence is above the amended guidelines range."). Locklair fails to establish an abuse of discretion by the district court, see United States v. Smalls, 720 F.3d 193, 195 (4th Cir. 2013) (stating standard of review), and we therefore affirm the district court's order. United States v. Locklair, No. 4:11-cr-02079-TLW-1 (D.S.C. Feb. 9, 2016).

* Application of Amendment 782 to Locklair reduced his Guidelines range from 188 to 235 months' imprisonment to 151 to 188 months' imprisonment.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED