NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SUSSAN NG and LIN XIE,	No. 14-73000
Petitioners,	Agency Nos. A098-176-997
v.	A098-176-996
JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General,	MEMORANDUM*
Respondent.	

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

Submitted April 11, 2017**

Before: GOULD, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Sussan Ng and Lin Xie, natives of China and citizens of Australia, petition

pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying

their motion to reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v.*

---

*   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).

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 denying petitioners' second motion to reopen as untimely and number-barred, where it was filed more than six years after the order of removal became final, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and they have not established that any statutory or regulatory exception applies, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3).

We lack jurisdiction to consider petitioners' challenges to their underlying proceedings, the BIA's 2007 dismissal of their appeal from an immigration judge's finding of removability, and the BIA's 2008 denial of their motion to reconsider and 2012 denial of their first motion to reopen, because this petition is not timely as to those orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1).

To the extent petitioners seek prosecutorial discretion, we lack jurisdiction to consider such a request. *See Vilchiz-Soto v. Holder*, 688 F.3d 642, 644 (9th Cir. 2012) (order).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.