

MAR 20 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RAJVEER MUTTI, a.k.a. Rajpal Singh,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 12-70711

Agency No. A097-744-673

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.

Rajveer Mutti, a native and citizen of India, petitions 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

---

\* 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).

BIA's denial of a motion to reconsider. *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002). We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review any challenge to the BIA's October 4, 2011, order denying Mutti's motion to reopen because Mutti's petition is not timely as to that decision. *See Ma v. Ashcroft*, 361 F.3d 553, 557 n.6 (9th Cir. 2004).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Mutti's motion to reconsider because he failed to show any error of fact or law in the BIA's denial of his motion to reopen. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1); *see also Toufighi v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 988, 996-97 (9th Cir. 2008). We reject Mutti's contentions that the BIA failed to fully consider his arguments and evidence or to adequately explain its decision. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990-91 (9th Cir. 2010).

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