

MAY 04 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FERNANDO VASQUEZ-DE LA MORA  
and MARIA DE LA DEFENSA  
FIGUEROA-RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-70978

Agency Nos. A076-610-952  
A076-610-953

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 20, 2011\*\*

Before: RYMER, THOMAS, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Fernando Vasquez-De La Mora and Maria De La Defensa Figueroa-Rodriguez, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration

---

\* 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).

judge's decision 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 and de novo due process claims. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen because the motion was filed more than five years after the BIA's final order of removal, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and petitioners failed to establish that they acted with the due diligence required for equitable tolling, *see Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 897 (9th Cir. 2003) (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"). Petitioners' due process claim therefore fails. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error for a due process violation).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**