

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 11-10144  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT OCTOBER 6, 2011 JOHN LEY CLERK
--

Agency No. A075-892-415

JONAS VELASCO-ROJAS,

Petitioner,

versus

U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
US DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,

Respondents.

---

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

---

(October 6, 2011)

Before EDMONDSON, CARNES and KRAVITCH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Jonas Velasco-Rojas petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' denial of his motion to reconsider.

After the immigration judge determined that Velasco-Rojas was neither entitled to asylum nor eligible for cancellation of removal, he appealed to the BIA. In his appeal he argued that the IJ abused its discretion in failing to consider his membership in a particular social group. The BIA dismissed his appeal, however, finding that he did not define the social group or provide a persuasive argument for disturbing the IJ's decision. Velasco-Rojas then filed a motion to reconsider with the BIA in which he argued that the BIA had failed to consider that he was persecuted on the basis of his political opinion. The BIA denied Velasco-Rojas' motion to reconsider, reasoning that his arguments in that motion related only to a political opinion claim and did not assert a specific error with respect to the BIA's previous determination that he did not belong to a particular social group.

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 (2007). "Our review is limited to determining whether the BIA exercised its discretion in an arbitrary or capricious manner." Jiang v. U.S. Att'y Gen., 568 F.3d 1252, 1256 (11th Cir. 2009). An alien may file a motion requesting that the BIA reconsider a prior decision, but that motion must specify the errors of law or fact in the BIA's

previous order and must be supported by pertinent authority. 8 U.S.C.

§ 1229a(c)(6).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Velasco-Rojas' motion to reconsider. Contrary to his argument, the BIA did not improperly refuse to consider his political opinion claim, which Velasco-Rojas did not present to the BIA in his initial appeal. His motion to reconsider did not specify any errors of law or fact in the BIA's previous order.

**PETITION DENIED.**