

FEB 3 2017

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

BENITO DOMINGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

DANA J. BOENTE, Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 15-71579

Agency No. A070-223-487

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted January 18, 2017**

Before: TROTT, TASHIMA, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Benito Dominguez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Avagyan v. Holder*, 646 F.3d 672, 674 (9th Cir. 2011), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Dominguez's motion to reopen as untimely, where he filed it over twelve years after the final administrative order of removal, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and he 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 an alien who is prevented from timely filing a motion to reopen due to deception, fraud, or error, as long as the alien exercises due diligence in discovering such circumstances).

In light of this disposition, we do not reach Dominguez's remaining contentions regarding the alleged ineffective assistance of prior counsel, his compliance with the procedural requirements of *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), or his eligibility for adjustment of status.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.