

MAR 25 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PATRICIA ALVAREZ GONZALEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-74114

Agency No. A079-539-849

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.

Patricia Alvarez Gonzalez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying her motion to reopen removal proceedings based on ineffective assistance of counsel.

---

\* 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).

We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen and de novo claims of due process violations in immigration proceedings. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Alvarez Gonzalez's motion to reopen as untimely because the motion was filed more than one year after the BIA's September 26, 2005, order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Alvarez Gonzalez failed to establish that she acted with the due diligence required to warrant tolling of the 90-day filing deadline, *see Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 897 (9th Cir. 2003) (equitable tolling is available to petitioner who is prevented from filing due to deception, fraud or error, and exercises due diligence in discovering such circumstances).

In light of our disposition, we need not reach Alvarez Gonzalez's contention that her former attorney's performance caused her prejudice.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**