**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-1938**

---

ALEJANDRO GONZALES-SILVA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

**No. 07-1143**

---

ALEJANDRO GONZALES-SILVA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

**No. 07-1683**

---

ALEJANDRO GONZALES-SILVA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

---

Submitted: November 20, 2008 Decided: December 15, 2008

---

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Petitions dismissed in part and denied in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas A. Elliot, Fabienne Chatain, Thomas H. Tousley, ELLIOT & MAYOCK, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Assistant Attorney General, Lyle D. Jentzer, Senior Litigation Counsel, Stacey I. Young, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alejandro Gonzales-Silva, a native and citizen of Peru, seeks review of orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming the Immigration Judge's discretionary denial of his application for adjustment of status and denying his motions to reopen and reconsider. We have fully considered Gonzales-Silva's contentions, and conclude that we are without jurisdiction to review the Board's order affirming the discretionary denial of adjustment of status. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i) (2006). Next, we have reviewed Gonzales-Silva's arguments and find no abuse of discretion in the Board's orders denying Gonzales-Silva's motions to reopen and reconsider. See 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2008); Afanwi v. Mukasey, 526 F.3d 788 (4th Cir. 2008).

Accordingly, we dismiss in part and deny in part the petitions for review. 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.

PETITIONS DISMISSED IN PART
AND DENIED IN PART