

JUN 27 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

| |
|---|
| <p>CHENGMIN DU,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p> |
|---|

No. 10-71452

Agency No. A099-037-547

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 15, 2011**

Before: CANBY, O’SANNLAIN, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Chengmin Du, a native and citizen of China, petitions pro se 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 denial of a motion to reconsider, *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d

* 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).

960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002), and we dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

The BIA was within its discretion in denying Du's motion to reconsider because the motion failed to identify any error of fact or law in the BIA's October 20, 2009, order. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1); *Socop-Gonzalez v. INS*, 272 F.3d 1176, 1180 n.2 (9th Cir. 2001) (en banc).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Du's contention that the immigration judge was biased because he failed to raise that issue before the BIA and thereby failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004).

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's October 20, 2009, order because this petition for review is not timely as to that order. *See Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.