

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 5, 2013*

Decided December 26, 2013

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, *Circuit Judge*

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

No. 13-2451

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

AUZIO HEWLETT,
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United
States District Court for the
Eastern District of Wisconsin.

No. 03-CR-23
C.N. Clevert, Jr., *Judge.*

Order

The United States' motion for summary affirmance is granted.

Last year we held that the district court had properly denied Auzio Hewlett's motion under 18 U.S.C. §3582(c)(2) seeking a lower sentence. We observed that Hewlett,

* 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); Cir. R. 34(f).

whose sentence was set by a statutory minimum, could not receive any benefit from a reduction in the range under the Sentencing Guidelines.

Hewlett then filed another §3582(c)(2) motion, the district court denied it again, and Hewlett appealed again. We affirm again.

United States v. Redd, 630 F.3d 649 (7th Cir. 2011), holds that §3582(c)(2) authorizes only one motion, per prisoner, per retroactive change in the Guidelines. *Redd* required the district court to deny this successive motion. Moreover, the only support that Hewlett offered for his new motion—the decision of a panel in *United States v. Blewett*, 719 F.3d 482 (6th Cir. 2013), is incompatible with the law of this circuit, see *United States v. Foster*, 706 F.3d 887 (7th Cir. 2013), and has been repudiated by the Sixth Circuit itself. See *United States v. Blewett*, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 24018 (6th Cir. Dec. 3, 2013) (en banc).

AFFIRMED