

MAR 08 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARIA EUGENIA HERRERA,  
  
Petitioner,  
  
v.  
  
ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,  
  
Respondent.

No. 07-70290

Agency No. A095-451-368

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 Eugenia Herrera, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying her motion to reopen proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 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). We deny the petition for review.

Herrera's contention that the BIA overlooked the basis of the motion is not supported by the record. To the extent we have jurisdiction to review the BIA's denial of the motion to reopen, *see Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 601 (9th Cir. 2006), we conclude the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Herrera's motion to reopen based on new evidence of hardship because the BIA considered the evidence and acted within its broad discretion in determining the evidence was insufficient to establish prima facie eligibility for cancellation of removal. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law.").

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**