

NOV 29 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARTIN RAFAEL FONSECA ROJAS; NANCY E. FONSECA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 11-72246

Agency Nos.       A099-740-272  
                              A099-740-273

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted November 19, 2013\*\*

Before:       CANBY, TROTT, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Martin Rafael Fonseca Rojas and Nancy E. Fonseca, natives and citizens of Peru, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their motion to reconsider. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the BIA’s denial of a motion to

---

\* 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).

reconsider. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reconsider because petitioners failed to identify any error of fact or law in the underlying decision. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1); *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) (The BIA “does not have to write an exegesis on every contention.”).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**