

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

MAR 25 2011

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

PABLO ANGEL RODRIGUEZ-  
ARELLANO,  
  
Petitioner,  
  
v.  
  
ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,  
  
Respondent.

No. 06-75243

Agency No. A075-736-742

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted March 8, 2011\*\*

Before: FARRIS, O'SCANNLAIN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Pablo Angel Rodriguez-Arellano, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reconsider. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the BIA's denial of a motion to reconsider and review de

---

\* 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).

novo legal and constitutional claims. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Rodriguez-Arellano's motion to reconsider where the motion did not identify any error of fact or law in the BIA's prior order. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1). It follows that the BIA did not violate due process. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error for a petitioner to prevail on a due process claim).

To the extent Rodriguez-Arellano raises a due process challenge to the BIA's dismissal of his direct appeal, we lack jurisdiction because he failed to file a petition for review of that decision. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.**