

JUN 16 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>VICENTE GARCIA MIRANDA, et al.,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 12-73324

Agency Nos. A079-543-659
 A079-543-660
 A079-543-661

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 12, 2014**

Before: McKEOWN, WARDLAW, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Vicente Garcia Miranda, Maria Monica Garcia, and Julio Valentin Garcia Gonzalez, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying their 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).

denial of a motion to reconsider. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in its October 3, 2012, order denying petitioners' successive motion to reconsider as number-barred. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(2) ("A party may file only one motion to reconsider any given decision and may not seek reconsideration of a decision denying a previous motion to reconsider.").

We lack jurisdiction to review petitioners' challenge to the BIA's order of December 5, 2011, denying their earlier motion to reconsider, because this petition for review is untimely as to that order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *Membreno v. Gonzales*, 425 F.3d 1227, 1229 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc).

We also lack jurisdiction to consider petitioners' contention that their case warrants a favorable exercise of prosecutorial discretion. *See Vilchiz-Soto v. Holder*, 688 F.3d 642, 644 (9th Cir. 2012) (order).

In light of our disposition, we need not address petitioners' remaining contentions.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.