

MAR 01 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARIA LEONOR JUAN; MARIO  
OCAMPO JUAN,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-70278

Agency Nos. A095-299-346  
A095-299-345

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 15, 2011\*\*

Before: CANBY, FERNANDEZ, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Maria Leonor Juan and Mario Ocampo Juan, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to

---

\* 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).

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 acted within its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely because it was filed more than 90 days after the BIA's final removal order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to establish that they were entitled to equitable tolling of the filing deadline, *see Iturribarria*, 321 F.3d at 897 (deadline for filing a motion to reopen can be equitably tolled when a petitioner is prevented from filing because of deception, fraud, or error).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's July 26, 2006, order dismissing petitioners' appeal from an immigration judge's decision because this petition for review 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.**