Case: 13-11195 Document: 00512743547 Page: 1 Date Filed: 08/22/2014

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-11195 Summary Calendar United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED August 22, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

CRYSTAL LA VON MASON-HOBBS,

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas USDC No. 4:11-CR-151-1

Before REAVLEY, DENNIS, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Crystal La Von Mason-Hobbs, federal prisoner # 43617-177, pleaded guilty to conspiracy to defraud the United States and was sentenced within the guidelines to 60 months of imprisonment and three years of supervised release. The district court also ordered her to pay \$4,206,805.49 in restitution and a \$100 special assessment. After the district court denied her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, Mason-Hobbs filed a "Motion for Reconsideration and Sentence

^{*} Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 13-11195

Reduction." The district court denied the motion, and Mason-Hobbs appeals from that ruling.

A district court may modify the imposed term of imprisonment under limited circumstances. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c). Mason-Hobbs's motion does not fall under any of the provisions of § 3582(c), and she is precluded from obtaining relief under 18 U.S.C. § 3742, as relief thereunder is reserved only for direct appeals. See United States v. Early, 27 F.3d 140, 141-42 (5th Cir. 1994). Moreover, the motion does not arise under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 because the district court did not suggest that it was so construing the motion and it did not provide Mason-Hobbs notice. See Castro v. United States, 540 U.S. 375, 381-83 (2003). In sum, Mason-Hobbs's motion seeking a reduction of her sentence is an unauthorized motion without a jurisdictional basis. See Early, 27 F.3d at 142. The district court's judgment denying the motion is AFFIRMED. Her motion for appointment is DENIED.