

JUN 11 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>PEDRO ARENAS-CELAYA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 08-70250

Agency No. A092-239-895

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.

Pedro Arenas-Celaya, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying his motion to reopen.

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

* 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)*.

(9th Cir. 2003), and de novo due process claims, *Vasquez-Zavala v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 1105, 1107 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Arenas-Celaya's motion to reopen because it was filed more than two years after the BIA's May 19, 2005, order dismissing the underlying appeal, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2) (motion to reopen generally must be filed within 90 days of the final order), and Arenas-Celaya failed to establish 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"). It follows that Arenas-Celaya's due process claim fails. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error and prejudice for a petitioner to prevail on a due process claim).

To the extent Arenas-Celaya challenges the BIA's October 27, 2003, order dismissing his underlying appeal, we lack jurisdiction because the petition for review is not timely as to that order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's decision not to invoke 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.