

DEC 09 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MOISES ORTEGA-AGUILAR,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 06-74062

Agency No. A075-766-447

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.

Moises Ortega-Aguilar, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

* 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).

review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Ordonez v. INS*, 345 F.3d 777, 782 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Ortega’s motion to reopen because it considered the evidence submitted and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (The BIA’s denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed if it is “arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law”).

Ortega’s contention that the BIA failed to explain adequately its reasons for denying the motion to reopen is belied by the record. *See Lopez v. Ashcroft*, 366 F.3d 799, 807, n.6 (9th Cir. 2004) (BIA is required to “consider the issues raised, and announce its decision in terms sufficient to enable a reviewing court to perceive that it has heard and thought and not merely reacted”) (citation omitted).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.