

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-12878
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 8:03-cr-00273-SDM-MAP-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

MICHAEL DAVID MCDONALD,
a.k.a. James Richard Brown,
a.k.a. Michael David Taylor,
a.k.a. Michael Palmer,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida

(May 20, 2013)

Before CARNES, BARKETT and PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Michael McDonald appeals pro se the denial of his renewed motion to reduce his sentence based on Amendment 750 to the Sentencing Guidelines. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2). The district court denied McDonald's first motion to reduce on the ground that he was a career offender and ineligible for a reduction of his sentence, see United States v. Lawson, 686 F.3d 1317, 1321 (11th Cir. 2012), and McDonald did not appeal that decision. The decision that the district court lacked authority to reduce McDonald's sentence is the law of the case, see United States v. Escobar-Urrego, 110 F.3d 1556, 1560 (11th Cir. 1997), and McDonald does not challenge that binding decision. The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying McDonald's renewed motion to reduce, which duplicated the argument made in McDonald's first motion.

We **AFFIRM** the denial of McDonald's second motion to reduce.