

OCT 20 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SEMEN ABRAMIAN, AKA Semen Arasesovich Abramyan and ELEONARA ABRAMIAN, AKA Eleonora Abramyan,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>

No. 13-74033

Agency Nos. A070-947-920
 A070-947-921

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 14, 2015**

Before: SILVERMAN, BYBEE, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Semen Abramian and Eleonara Abramian, citizens of Georgia, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s order denying their motion to reopen

* 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).

deportation proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely, where they filed the motion fifteen years after their final deportation order and after September 30, 1996, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(1), and failed to establish the due diligence required for equitable tolling of the filing deadline, *see Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 897 (9th Cir. 2003) (equitable tolling is available "when a petitioner is prevented from filing because of deception, fraud, or error, as long as the petitioner acts with due diligence in discovering the deception, fraud, or error").

In light of this disposition, we do not address petitioners' remaining contentions regarding due process and compliance with the procedural requirements set forth in *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 637 (BIA 1988).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.