

MAR 24 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARCO ANTONIO BUENO-BARAJAS,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 07-71773

Agency No. A092-081-357

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted March 16, 2010**

Before: SCHROEDER, PREGERSON, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

Marco Antonio Bueno-Barajas, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his motion to reopen. Our

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

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

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

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Bueno-Barajas' motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed more than six years after the IJ's June 21, 2000, removal order. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(1). We are not persuaded by Bueno-Barajas' contention that the vacatur of his prior conviction establishes an exception to the 90-day filing deadline. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(4). The untimeliness determination is dispositive of Bueno-Barajas' remaining contentions.

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.