

JUN 04 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

BERTHA QUINTERO,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-71750

Agency No. A079-532-852

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 25, 2010**
San Francisco, California

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

Bertha Quintero, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying her motion to

* 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).

reopen/reconsider her removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

If we construe Quintero's motion as a motion to reopen, the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion where the new evidence she presented with the motion did not support prima facie eligibility for cancellation of removal. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 600 (9th Cir.2006).

Even if we construed the motion as a motion to reconsider, the BIA was within its discretion in denying Quintero's motion where the motion failed to identify any error of fact or law in the BIA's prior decision affirming the immigration judge's order denying cancellation of removal. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1); *Socop-Gonzalez v. INS*, 272 F.3d 1176, 1180 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2001) (en banc).

To the extent Quintero challenges the BIA's February 5, 2008 order, we lack jurisdiction because this petition for review is not timely as to that order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *see Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.