

NOV 30 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SERAFIN TINOCO-GARIBAY,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 07-70185

Agency No. A044-544-620

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 17, 2009**

Before: ALARCÓN, TROTT, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Serafin Tinoco-Garibay, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying his motion to reopen based on ineffective assistance of counsel. Our jurisdiction is governed by

* 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).

8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review the denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Tinoco-Garibay's motion to reopen as untimely because it was filed more than two years after the BIA's final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(1), and he failed to present evidence that he exercised diligence in discovering his prior attorney's errors, *see id.* at 897 (equitable tolling is available to a petitioner who establishes deception, fraud, or error, and exercised due diligence in discovering such circumstances).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Tinoco-Garibay's contentions regarding the BIA's March 23, 2004 order, because this petition for review is not timely as to that order. *See Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.