US v. Antione Boyce Appeal: 17-6051 Doc: 9 Fi

Filed: 04/04/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6051	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
Plaintiff - Appellee,	
v.	
ANTIONE BOYCE, a/k/a Dallas,	
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-00383-CCB-3)	
Submitted: March 30, 2017	Decided: April 4, 2017
Before TRAXLER and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and I	HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.	
Antione Boyce, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Clayt Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.	on Hanlon, Assistant United States
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in th	is circuit.

Doc. 406467705

Appeal: 17-6051 Doc: 9 Filed: 04/04/2017 Pg: 2 of 2

PER CURIAM:

Antione Boyce 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>U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual</u> § 1B1.10(d), p.s. (2016); USSG app. C, amend. 782, it "does not have the effect of lowering [Boyce's] applicable guideline range because of the operation of another guideline or statutory provision." USSG § 1B1.10, p.s., cmt. n.1(A). Accordingly, Boyce was not entitled to a sentence reduction under § 3582(c)(2), and the district court thus did not reversibly err in denying Boyce's 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*, 844 F.3d 434, 438-42 (4th Cir. 2016).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's denial order. *United States v. Boyce*, No. 1:07-cr-00383-CCB-3 (D. Md. Dec. 13, 2016). 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