

APR 26 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SERGIO VARGAS CANO and MARIA
DEL PILAR VARGAS,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-71138

Agency Nos. A075-728-732

A075-728-733

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted April 5, 2011**

Before: B. FLETCHER, CLIFTON, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Sergio Vargas Cano and Maria Del Pilar Vargas, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen,

* 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).

and de novo ineffective assistance of counsel claims, *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely because it was filed more than three years after the BIA's final order of removal, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(C)(i) (motion to reopen must be filed within 90 days of final order of removal), and petitioners did not show they were entitled to equitable tolling, *see Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 897 (9th Cir. 2003).

Petitioners' contention that the BIA erred by failing to address their statutory right to counsel claim is unavailing because the BIA denied the motion on timeliness grounds.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.