

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-6038

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

STERLING VERNARD GREEN,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (4:06-cr-01322-TLW-4)

Submitted: March 23, 2021

Decided: March 26, 2021

Before THACKER, QUATTLEBAUM, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sterling Vernard Green, Appellant Pro Se. Lauren L. Hummel, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sterling Vernard Green appeals the district court's order denying his motion for sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(B) and § 404(b) of the First Step Act of 2018, Pub. L. No. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194, 5222. He argues that the district court erred in failing to consider his amended range under the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual and evidence of his post-sentencing rehabilitation and in failing to grant him a plenary resentencing. We affirm.

Our review of the record discloses that the district court considered Green's amended Guidelines range and that Green did not advance his post-sentencing rehabilitation efforts as a basis for receiving a sentence reduction in the district court. Additionally, the Supreme Court has recognized that "a sentence modification is not a plenary resentencing proceeding," *Chavez-Meza v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 1959, 1967 (2018) (internal quotation marks omitted) (addressing sentence reduction motion under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)), and, in any event, Green fails to advance any reason why such a resentencing would be warranted in this case.

Green fails to establish reversible error by the district court, and we thus affirm its denial order. *United States v. Green*, No. 4:06-cr-01322-TLW-4 (D.S.C. Dec. 11, 2019). 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