

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with
Fed. R. App. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals**For the Seventh Circuit****Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted December 6, 2013*

Decided December 20, 2013

BeforeRICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*JOHN DANIEL TINDER, *Circuit Judge*DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

No. 13-2872

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*Plaintiff-Appellee,**v.*DEXTER ANDERSON,
*Defendant-Appellant.*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Eastern District of
Wisconsin.

No. 03-CR-261

William C. Griesbach,
*Chief Judge.***ORDER**

*This successive appeal has been submitted to the original panel under Operating Procedure 6(b). After examining the briefs and the record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2).

No. 13-2872

Page 2

Dexter Anderson appeals from the district court's denial of his motion for a reduced sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) based on the Sentencing Commission's retroactive amendment of the crack-cocaine sentencing guidelines. *See* U.S.S.G. app. C, amend. 750. This is Anderson's third effort to obtain relief under § 3582(c)(2) from his below-guidelines, 300-month sentence for several crack-cocaine and firearm offenses. We upheld the district court's denials of his first two motions, the second of which was based on Amendment 750. *See United States v. Anderson*, 365 Fed. App'x 17 (7th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Anderson*, 488 Fed. App'x 129 (7th Cir. 2012). Anderson's third attempt again relied on Amendment 750, but Congress has authorized only one sentence-reduction motion in response to a given change in the Guidelines. *See United States v. Redd*, 630 F.3d 649, 651 (7th Cir. 2011). Anderson may not use this successive motion to make a different argument for relief under Amendment 750, *see id.*, so the district court was right to deny his motion.

AFFIRMED.