IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

| FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT | | ELEVENTH CIRCUIT |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| | No. 08-17252 Non-Argument Calendar | JUNE 8, 2009 THOMAS K. KAHN CLERK |
| D. C | . Docket No. 05-14074-CR-JEI | M |
| UNITED STATES OF AM | ERICA, | |
| | | Plaintiff-Appellee, |
| | versus | |
| MACK CHARLES WILLIA | AMS, | |
| | | Defendant-Appellant. |
| - | | |
| | from the United States District of the Southern District of Florida | |
| | (June 8, 2009) | |
| Before BARKETT, MARC | US and ANDERSON, Circuit J | udges. |
| PER CURIAM: | | |
| Mook Charles William | ns anneals the district court's de | anial of his motion for a |

reduced sentence, filed pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). Williams's § 3582(c)(2) motion was based on Amendment 706 to the United States Sentencing Guidelines, which reduced base offense levels applicable to crack cocaine.

Williams argues that the district court erred as a matter of law in denying his motion for a reduced sentence because he was sentenced as a career offender.

Williams concedes that the issue he raises on appeal is controlled by our decision in <u>United States v. Moore</u>, 541 F.3d 1323, 1327 (11th Cir. 2008), <u>cert. denied</u>, <u>McFadden v. United States</u>, 129 S. Ct. 965 (2009), <u>and cert. denied</u>, (U.S. Mar. 9, 2009) (No. 08-8554), but he argues that <u>Moore</u> was wrongly decided as the sentencing guidelines are fully advisory, even in § 3582 proceedings.

The district court did not err in denying Williams's § 3582(c)(2) motion because he was sentenced as a career offender. Moore, 541 F.3d at 1330 (holding that a district court lacks authority under § 3582(c)(2) to reduce a defendant's sentence when the defendant was sentenced under U.S.S.G. § 4B1.1 as a career offender). Additionally, Williams's argument that the sentencing guidelines are fully advisory, even in § 3582 proceedings, is also foreclosed by precedent. See United States v. Melvin, 556 F.3d 1190, 1192-93 (11th Cir. 2009) (holding that United States v. Booker, 543 U.S. 220 (2005) does not "prohibit the limitations on a judge's discretion in reducing a sentence imposed by § 3582(c)(2) and the

applicable policy statement by the Sentencing Commission"), petition for cert. filed, (U.S. Feb. 10, 2009) (No. 08-8664). Accordingly, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.