

MAR 13 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MUDIAGA OBIJURU URIE, a.k.a. Troy Urie, a.k.a. Troy Mudiaga Urie, a.k.a. Mydiaga Urig,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
---

Nos. 12-73672  
13-70209

Agency No. A098-409-078

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 10, 2014\*\*

Before: PREGERSON, LEAVY, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

In these consolidated petitions for review, Mudiaga Obijuru Urie, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) orders denying his motions to reopen and reconsider. We have

---

\* 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).

jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of motions to reopen and reconsider. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petitions for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Urie's motion to reopen as untimely where he filed his motion more than four years after his final removal order, and he did not establish that his motion was subject to equitable tolling to delay the filing deadline for the sole purpose of allowing his visa petition to become current. *See Socop-Gonzalez v. INS*, 272 F.3d 1176, 1193 (9th Cir. 2001) (en banc) (equitable tolling available where petitioner is unable to obtain vital information bearing on the existence of a claim because of circumstances beyond petitioner's control). Accordingly, the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Urie's motion to reconsider because he failed to establish any error in its prior order. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1); *Socop-Gonzalez*, 272 F.3d at 1180 n.2.

**PETITIONS FOR REVIEW DENIED.**