NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARIA D. RODRIGUEZ-CASTRO,	No. 10-72340
Petitioner,	Agency No. A073-904-077
v.	
ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,	MEMORANDUM*
Respondent.	

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

Submitted July 17, 2012**

Before: SCHROEDER, THOMAS, and SILVERMAN, Circuit Judges.

Maria D. Rodriguez-Castro, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for

review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an

immigration judge's decision denying her motion to reopen deportation

proceedings conducted in absentia. Our jurisdiction is governed 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

---

     *   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).

We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Chete Juarez v. Ashcroft*, 376 F.3d 944, 947 (9th Cir. 2004), and we deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Rodriguez-Castro's motion to reopen where the Order to Show Cause was sent by certified mail to her address of record, and the record contains a signed certified mail return receipt. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252b(a)(1), (c)(1) (1995); *Chaidez v. Gonzales*, 486 F.3d 1079, 1083 (9th Cir. 2007).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Rodriguez-Castro's contention that the signature on her asylum application does not match the signature on the return receipt because she failed to raise that issue before the BIA and thereby failed to exhaust her administrative remedies. *See Tijani v. Holder*, 628 F.3d 1071, 1080 (9th Cir. 2010) (no jurisdiction to review legal claims not presented before the BIA).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.