FILED

OCT 05 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FELIPE RAMIRO ANGON MARTINEZ, Petitioner, v. ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 06-72429 Agency No. A097-361-181 MEMORANDUM[*]

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

Submitted September 14, 2009[**]

Before: SILVERMAN, RAWLINSON, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Felipe Ramiro Angon Martinez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reconsider. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse

---

[*] 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).

DL/Research

of discretion both the denial of a motion to reconsider, *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002), and the denial of a continuance, *Sandoval-Luna v. Mukasey*, 526 F.3d 1243, 1246 (9th Cir. 2008) (per curiam), and we deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA acted within its discretion in denying Angon Martinez's motion to reconsider because the motion failed to identify any error of fact or law in the BIA's prior order. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1).

The BIA also acted within its discretion in denying a continuance on the ground that Angon Martinez failed to demonstrate good cause. *See Sandoval-Luna*, 526 F.3d at 1247.

To the extent Angon Martinez challenges the BIA's February 7, 2006, order, we lack jurisdiction because Angon Martinez did not timely petition for review of that order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.