

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7550

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CARLOS WOODS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, Chief District Judge. (1:07-cr-00127-WDQ-1)

Submitted: January 31, 2017

Decided: February 3, 2017

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carlos Woods, Appellant Pro Se. John Walter Sippel, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Carlos Woods appeals from the district court's order denying his 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (2012) motion for reduction of sentence based on Amendment 782 to the Sentencing Guidelines. Although Amendment 782 to the Guidelines lowered offense levels applicable to drug offenses by two levels and is retroactively applicable, see U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 1B1.10(d), p.s. (2016); USSG app. C, amend. 782, Woods was determined to be a career offender under the Guidelines, and his status as a career offender is not affected by Amendment 782. Because Amendment 782 "does not have the effect of lowering [Woods'] applicable guideline range because of the operation of another guideline or statutory provision," USSG § 1B1.10, p.s., cmt. n.1(A), he was not entitled to a sentence reduction under § 3582(c)(2). The district court thus did not reversibly err in denying Woods' motion. See USSG § 1B1.10(a)(2)(B), p.s.; United States v. Munn, 595 F.3d 183, 187 (4th Cir. 2010), abrogation on other grounds recognized in United States v. Muldrow, ___ F.3d ___, Nos. 15-7298, 15-7608, 2016 WL 7441620, at **3-6 (4th Cir. Dec. 27, 2016).

Accordingly, although we grant Woods' motion to file a supplemental informal opening brief, we affirm the district court's denial order. United States v. Woods, No. 1:07-cr-00127-WDQ-1 (D. Md. Oct. 21, 2016). We deny Woods'

motions to appoint counsel and for a transcript at government expense and 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