

SEP 18 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ALEJANDRO VARONA ALONZO,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---

No. 11-70061

Agency No. A077-216-024

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 10, 2012\*\*

Before: WARDLAW, CLIFTON, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Alejandro Varona Alonzo, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s order denying his motion to reopen based on ineffective assistance of counsel. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

---

\* 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).

review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen, *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Varona Alonzo's motion to reopen for failure to comply with the requirements set forth in *Matter of Lozada*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), where the ineffective assistance he alleges is not plain on the face of the record. *See Reyes v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 592, 596-99 (9th Cir. 2004).

We do not consider the extra-record evidence submitted for the first time with Varona Alonzo's opening brief because the court's review is limited to the administrative record. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(A).

**\_\_\_\_\_ PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**