

JUL 26 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ANGEL FLORES-FLORES,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 08-70741

Agency No. A073-129-054

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.

Angel Flores-Flores, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his motion to reopen deportation proceedings conducted in absentia. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

* 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).

We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Flores-Flores' motion to reopen as untimely where Flores-Flores filed the motion more than 11 years after his deportation order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(4)(iii)(A)(1) (motion to reopen based on exceptional circumstances must be filed within 180 days of the deportation order), and failed to establish that he acted with the due diligence required for equitable tolling, *see Iturribarria*, 321 F.3d at 897 (equitable tolling available to a petitioner who is prevented from filing due to deception, fraud or error, and exercises due diligence in discovering such circumstances); *cf. Ghahremani v. Gonzales*, 498 F.3d 993, 1000 (9th Cir. 2007) (due diligence shown where petitioner demonstrated "steadfast pursuit" of his case).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.