

JUN 09 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

LUIS ORLANDO ZEL CHAN, a.k.a. Luis Orlando El Chan; MARTHA ALICIA OROZCO AGUILAR, a.k.a. Martha Alicia Roscoe-Aguilar,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-73939

Agency Nos. A095-316-003
A095-316-004

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.

Luis Orlando Zel Chan and Martha Alicia Orozco Aguilar, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have

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

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying petitioners' motion to reopen, because the BIA considered the evidence they submitted and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (The BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law.").

To the extent petitioners contend that the BIA failed to consider some or all of the evidence they submitted with the motion to reopen, they have not overcome the presumption that the BIA did review the record. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 603 (9th Cir. 2006).

Petitioners' remaining contentions are unavailing.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.