

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-7696**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TERRANCE BRADLEY THOMPSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge. (1:07-cr-00033-LHT-12)

---

Submitted: May 28, 2009

Decided: June 3, 2009

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Claire J. Rauscher, Executive Director, Matthew R. Segal, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Asheville, North Carolina; Tanzania Cannon-Eckerle, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellant. Amy Elizabeth Ray, Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Terrance Bradley Thompson appeals the district court's orders denying his motion for modification of sentence pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) (2006) and denying his amended motion for reconsideration. Thompson argues that the district court erred by failing to reduce his sentence based on Amendment 706 of the Guidelines. See U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual ("USSG") § 2D1.1(c) (2007 & Supp. 2008); USSG App. C Amend. 706. As we recently observed, "Amendment 706 . . . amended § 2D1.1 of the Sentencing Guidelines by reducing the offense levels associated with crack cocaine quantities by two levels." United States v. Hood, 556 F.3d 226, 232 (4th Cir. 2009). "Because [Thompson's] 240-month Guidelines sentence was based on a statutory minimum and USSG § 5G1.1(b), it was not based on a sentencing range lowered by Amendment 706 . . . ." Id. at 233. The fact that the district court reduced Thompson's sentence for substantial assistance under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(e) (2006) and Fed. R. Crim. P. 35 is irrelevant to the applicability of Amendment 706. Hood, 556 F.3d at 234. Accordingly, we deny Thompson's motion for appointment of counsel and affirm the decision of the district court. 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