

JUL 16 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JUAN ANTONIO NAVA-HERNANDEZ; et al.,</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. 08-71840

Agency Nos. A096-362-284  
A096-362-285  
A096-362-286

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted June 29, 2010\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, LEAVY, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Juan Antonio Nava-Hernandez, Agripina Nava, and their son, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) decision denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings.

Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of

---

\* 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).

discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003), and de novo legal questions and alleged constitutional violations, *Figueroa v. Mukasey*, 543 F.3d 487, 496 (9th Cir. 2008), 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) (BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law").

Petitioners' remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**