

DEC 14 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARIA ROSALIA SOLORIZANO-
RENDEROS, a/k/a Maria Rosalio
Solorzano-Renderos,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-71520

Agency No. A027-196-301

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.

Maria Rosalia Solorizano-Renderos, a native and citizen of El Salvador,
petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying

* 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).

her motion to reconsider. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reconsider, *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002), and we deny in part and dismiss in part, the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Solorizano-Renderos' motion to reconsider as untimely because she filed the motion more than four years after the BIA issued its final order. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(2).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's decision not to invoke its sua sponte authority to reconsider proceedings under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a). *See Ekimian v. INS*, 303 F.3d 1153, 1159 (9th Cir. 2002).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's May 17, 2002, order dismissing Solorizano-Renderos' direct appeal 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.