

MAR 19 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RODRIGO VALENTI ALOISE,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 11-72598

Agency No. A098-800-849

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted March 12, 2013**

Before: PREGERSON, REINHARDT, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Rodrigo Valenti Aloise, a native and citizen of Brazil, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings conducted in absentia. We have jurisdiction under 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, *Avagyan v. Holder*, 646 F.3d 672, 678 (9th Cir. 2011), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Aloise's motion to reopen as untimely where it was filed more than two years after his removal order became final, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(5)(C)(i) (an alien seeking to reopen and rescind an in absentia removal order based on exceptional circumstances must file the motion within 180 days after the date of the removal order), and Aloise failed to set forth a basis for equitable tolling of the filing deadline, *see Avagyan*, 646 F.3d at 679 (equitable tolling of the filing deadline is available where petitioner establishes that he was prevented from filing because of deception, fraud or error, and acted with due diligence in discovering such circumstances).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.