

MAR 15 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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

MARWAN ABO EID,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-75090

Agency No. A070-641-038

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.

Marwan Abo Eid, a native and citizen of Syria, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, and review de novo claims of due process violations.

---

\* 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).

*Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Eid’s motion to reopen because it was filed more than five months after the BIA’s December 21, 2007, order dismissing his underlying appeal, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2) (motion to reopen generally must be filed within 90 days of the final order), and Eid failed to establish grounds for equitable tolling, *see Iturribarria*, 321 F.3d at 897 (equitable tolling available “when a petitioner is prevented from filing because of deception, fraud, or error, as long as the petitioner acts with due diligence”). It follows that the BIA did not violate due process by not reaching the merits of Eid’s ineffective assistance of counsel claim. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error and prejudice for a petitioner to prevail on a due process claim).

Eid’s remaining contentions are unavailing.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**