

JUN 02 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JESUS ENRIQUE RAMOS-MADRID; MARIA CONCEPCION CHAVEZ- RODRIGUEZ,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
---

No. 08-70368

Agency Nos. A075-750-001  
A075-750-002

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted May 25, 2010\*\*

Before: CANBY, THOMAS, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Jesus Enrique Ramos-Madrid and Maria Concepcion Chavez-Rodriguez,  
natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration  
Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reopen based on ineffective

---

\* 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).

assistance of counsel. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *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 petitioners' motion to reopen because the motion was filed more than 11 months after the BIA's July 25, 2006, orders dismissing the underlying appeals, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to demonstrate grounds for equitable tolling, *see Iturribarria*, 321 F.3d at 897 (equitable tolling available "when a petitioner is prevented from filing because of deception, fraud, or error, as long as the petitioner acts with due diligence").

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's July 25, 2006, orders dismissing petitioners' underlying appeals because this petition for review is not timely as to those orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.**