



Yanez argues to the contrary--but not based on anything in Amendment 591 or the Guidelines Manual. Instead he maintains that, under *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), and its successors, his maximum sentence was lower than the one the district court used in its calculations, because the jury had not found the facts needed to increase his sentencing range. But Amendment 591 is not designed to reopen federal sentences for retroactive application of *Apprendi*. Yanez has filed and lost one collateral attack; he is not entitled to wage another under the cover of Amendment 591. The *only* argument properly open now is one based on §3582(c)(2) and Amendment 591. The district judge properly concluded that these do not require a reduction of Yanez's sentence.

Affirmed