

SEP 02 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

LETICIA MORALES DE BOLANOS;
PEDRO BOLANOS YLLESCAS,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 06-73253

Agency Nos. A095-448-842
A095-448-843

MEMORANDUM *

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted August 20, 2009**

Before: WALLACE, HAWKINS, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Leticia Morales de Bolanos and Pedro Bolanos Yllescas, natives and citizens
of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals'

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

(“BIA”) order denying their motion to reconsider. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen or reconsider, *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners’ motion to reconsider because the motion failed to identify any errors of fact or law in the BIA’s April 10, 2006, order denying their motion to reopen. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1). Petitioners have waived any challenge to the BIA’s conclusion that, construed as a motion to reopen, the motion was numerically barred. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.