[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

FOR T	HE ELEVENTH CIRCUI	Т
Ne	No. 19-12392 on-Argument Calendar	
D.C. Docke	et No. 2:00-cr-00347-LSC-	JHE-1
UNITED STATES OF AMERI	ICA,	
		Plaintiff-Appellee,
versus		
MARIO ANTON LEE,		
		Defendant-Appellant.
	n the United States District Northern District of Alaban	
((September 10, 2020)	
Before JORDAN, NEWSOM, a	and LUCK, Circuit Judges	s.
PER CURIAM:		

Case: 19-12392 Date Filed: 09/10/2020 Page: 2 of 2

Mario Lee, proceeding *pro se*, appeals from the district court's order granting his motion for reduction of sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) based on Amendment 782 to the Sentencing Guidelines. We affirm.

The district court concluded that Amendment 782 made Mr. Lee – who was originally sentenced to 105 years in prison – eligible for a sentence reduction, and that his amended guideline range was 360 months to life imprisonment. The district court granted the § 3582(c) motion and sentenced Mr. Lee to 360 months in prison.

The arguments Mr. Lee presents on appeal – which were not raised below and are subject to plain-error review – are foreclosed by binding precedent. First, Mr. Lee argues that he should have had a hearing, but a district court is not required to hold a hearing on a § 3582(c) motion. *See United States v. Caraballo-Martinez*, 866 F.3d 1233, 1249 (11th Cir. 2017). Second, Mr. Lee seeks to attack his conviction and prior sentencing determinations, but such challenges are not cognizable through a § 3582(c) motion. *See United States v. Bravo*, 203 F.3d 778, 780 (11th Cir. 2000); *United States v. Fair*, 326 F.3d 1317, 1318 (11th Cir. 2003).*

AFFIRMED.

^{*}We deny Mr. Lee's request to recall the mandate in his 2002 criminal appeal, and motion for oral argument. We grant Mr. Lee's motion to amend the reply brief.