

OCT 01 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARIA TELMA VASQUEZ,</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. 11-72549

Agency No. A070-945-695

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 24, 2013**

Before: RAWLINSON, N.R. SMITH, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Maria Telma Vasquez, a native and citizen of Honduras, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s denial of her motion to reopen removal proceedings based on the ineffective assistance of counsel. 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, 674 (9th Cir. 2011). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Vasquez's motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed more than thirteen years after her removal order became final, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(1), and Vasquez failed to establish the due diligence required for equitable tolling of the filing deadline, *see Avagyan*, 646 F.3d at 679 (equitable tolling is available to a petitioner who is prevented from filing because of deception, fraud or error, and exercised due diligence in discovering such circumstances).

Because the timeliness issue is dispositive, we need not reach Vasquez's remaining contentions.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.