

JUN 28 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ZAINAB MOHAMMED,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
---

No. 09-73761

Agency No. A073-952-125

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted June 15, 2011\*\*

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

Zainab Mohammed, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying her motion to reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo due process claims, and for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Iturribarria v.*

---

\* 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).

*INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Mohammed’s motion to reopen for failure to comply with the requirements in *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 637 (BIA 1988). *See id.* at 900; *see also Tamang v. Holder*, 598 F.3d 1083, 1090-91 (9th Cir. 2010) (“By failing to provide any information regarding his purported former counsel, [petitioner] has failed to provide any other independent basis from which to analyze his claim.”).

Mohammed’s remaining contentions are unpersuasive.

We lack jurisdiction to review the BIA’s decision not to exercise authority to reopen proceedings sua sponte. *See Mejia-Hernandez v. Holder*, 633 F.3d 818, 823-24 (9th Cir. 2011).

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