

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 94-40639
Conference Calendar

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

REGINALD WATTS,

Defendant-Appellant.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 1:89-CR-101-5
- - - - -

(January 27, 1995)

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, and HIGGINBOTHAM and DeMOSS,
Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Reginald Watts argues that the district court's denial of his "Motion for Alternative Sentence" violated his Fourteenth Amendment right to equal protection. He argues that famous defendants Leona Helmsley, Michael Miliken, and Paul Bizerian, among others, were given the relief that he seeks, and he alleges discrimination on the basis of social status.

Watts has failed to present authority demonstrating that the district court possessed the authority to alter his sentence.

* Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Because no authority supports the alternative sentence sought by Watts, the district court was without jurisdiction to entertain Watts's motion. See United States v. Early, 27 F.3d 140, 142 (5th Cir. 1994) (district court lacked jurisdiction to entertain defendant's unauthorized motion for reduction of sentence), petition for cert. filed, (U.S. Oct. 13, 1994) (No. 94-6502); United States v. Lopez, 26 F.3d 512, 523 (5th Cir. 1994) (district court lacked authority to modify defendant's sentence).

Because the district court lacked jurisdiction over the case, the denial of Watt's motion was not error. Watts's appeal is DISMISSED.