IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-13754 Non-Argument Calendar FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
JUNE 24, 2011
JOHN LEY
CLERK

Agency No. A097-687-059

EYTAN IZYAGUYEV, a.k.a. Eytan Isiaguev,

Petitioner,

versus

U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

Petition for Review of a Decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals

(June 24, 2011)

Before TJOFLAT, CARNES and BARKETT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Eytan Izyaguyev petitions for review of the Bureau of Immigration

Appeals's ("BIA") denial of his motion to reconsider its summary affirmance of the Immigration Judge's ("IJ") denial of his motion to reopen his removal proceedings, in which the IJ ordered Izaguyev's removal *in absentia*.

We review the BIA's denial of a motion to reconsider for an abuse of discretion. *Calle v. U.S. Att'y Gen.*, 504 F.3d 1324, 1328 (11th Cir. 2007).¹ A motion to reconsider "shall specify the errors of law or fact in the previous order and shall be supported by pertinent authority." INA § 240(c)(6)(C), 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(6)(C); *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1). A motion to reconsider that merely reiterates arguments previously presented to the BIA does not specify errors of facts or law as required for a successful motion to reconsider. *Calle*, 504 F.3d at 1329. Here, the BIA properly found that the motion for reconsideration reiterated Izyaguyev's previous arguments and failed to point out an error of law or fact with respect to the BIA's summary affirmance of the IJ's denial of his motion to reopen. Accordingly, we deny Izyaguyev's petition for review.

PETITION DENIED.

¹ Although the government argues on appeal that there is no judicially manageable standard for reviewing the BIA's denial of the motion to reconsider, our case law provides that such motions are reviewed under an abuse-of-discretion standard. Accordingly, as stated in our March 2, 2011, order, we have jurisdiction to review the BIA's denial of Izyaguyev's motion to reconsider.