

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-1216**

---

PATRICIA ELETHIA DILLON-BONAPARTE,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A73-644-259)

---

Submitted: February 28, 2006

Decided: April 13, 2006

---

Before SHEDD and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and James P. JONES, Chief United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia, sitting by designation.

---

Petition dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alexander M. Chanthunya, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Carol Federighi, Senior Litigation Counsel, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Patricia Elethia Dillon-Bonaparte, a native and citizen of Jamaica, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying her motion to reconsider its previous decision of July 4, 2004. That decision vacated the immigration judge's grant of a good-faith marriage waiver to Dillon-Bonaparte pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1186a(c)(4)(B) (2000) and ordered her removal from the United States. In her brief before this court, Dillon-Bonaparte presents challenges to the Board's initial order of July 4, 2004, rather than raising arguments that the Board abused its discretion in denying her motion to reconsider. However, Dillon-Bonaparte failed to petition for review of that initial order. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1) (2000) (petition for review must be filed within 30 days of final order of removal); Stone v. INS, 514 U.S. 386, 394 (1995) (holding that the timely filing of a motion to reconsider with the Board does not toll the thirty-day period for seeking review of the underlying order). Accordingly, we find that Dillon-Bonaparte has abandoned the only issue that she could properly raise on appeal, and we therefore dismiss the petition for review. Given this disposition, we deny the Attorney General's motion to dismiss as moot. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DISMISSED