

DEC 27 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSE CAMACHO ARANDA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-72901

Agency No. A096-353-147

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted December 14, 2010**

Before: WALLACE, GOODWIN and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Jose Camacho Aranda, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597

* 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).

F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA acted within its discretion in denying Camacho Aranda’s motion to reopen for lack of evidence demonstrating a prima facie case for relief. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c); *Ordonez v. INS*, 345 F.3d 777, 785 (9th Cir. 2003) (holding that a motion to reopen must establish a prima facie case demonstrating “a reasonable likelihood that the statutory requirements for relief have been satisfied”); *see also Delgado-Ortiz v. Holder*, 600 F.3d 1148, 1151-52 (9th Cir. 2010) (rejecting as a particular social group “returning Mexicans from the United States”).

We lack jurisdiction to review Aranda’s contentions regarding the BIA’s November 30, 2007, order because this petition is not timely as to that order. *See Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.