

JUL 30 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>TERESA CORNEJO ARTEGA; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 08-71625

Agency Nos. A096-049-442  
A096-049-443  
A096-049-444

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted July 19, 2010\*\*

Before: B. FLETCHER, REINHARDT, and WARDLAW, Circuit Judges.

Teresa Cornejo Artega and her family, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C.

---

\* 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).

§ 1252. 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 in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen because it was filed more than 90 days after the BIA's final order of removal, and petitioners failed to demonstrate that they qualified for an exception to the 90-day time limit. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2)-(3).

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.**