

Filed: December 10, 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 08-6640  
(6:94-cr-00238-GRA-1)

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PAM TURNER, a/k/a Pamela M. Turner,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

O R D E R

---

The court amends its opinion filed November 14, 2008, as follows:

On the cover sheet, district court information section -- the name of "Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., Chief District Judge" is deleted and is replaced by "G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor  
Clerk

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-6640**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PAM TURNER, a/k/a Pamela M. Turner,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (6:94-cr-00238-GRA-1)

---

Submitted: October 22, 2008

Decided: November 14, 2008

---

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Pam Turner, Appellant Pro Se. Reginald I. Lloyd, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pam Turner appeals the district court's order granting in part her motion under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (2000), seeking a reduction in her sentence based on an amendment to the Sentencing Guidelines. Although the district court granted Turner's motion, it reduced her sentence for distribution of cocaine base from 180 months' imprisonment to 145 months, rather than the requested 121 months. We have reviewed the record and find no abuse of discretion or other reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm. See United States v. Goines, 357 F.3d 469, 478 (4th Cir. 2004) (motion under § 3582(c) "is subject to the discretion of the district court"); United States v. Legree, 205 F.3d 724, 727 (4th Cir. 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED