

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-2326

TULIA MARIA OROZCO; RICARDO ANTONIO ZULUAGA;
LUIS FELIPE ZULUAGA,

Petitioners,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
(A97-941-541; A97-941-542; A97-941-543)

Submitted: June 6, 2007

Decided: July 10, 2007

Before TRAXLER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ivan Yacub, LAW OFFICE OF IVAN YACUB, Falls Church, Virginia, for
Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Douglas
E. Ginsburg, Senior Litigation Counsel, Ada E. Bosque, Office of
Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tulia Maria Orozco, a native and citizen of Columbia, petitions for review the order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying her motion to reopen. Orozco claimed reopening was warranted because she had ineffective assistance of counsel before the immigration judge and on appeal. We deny the petition for review.

Our review of the Board's denial of a motion to reopen is extremely deferential, since immigration statutes do not contemplate reopening and the applicable regulations disfavor motions to reopen. M.A. v. INS, 899 F.2d 304, 308 (4th Cir. 1990) (en banc); INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323 (1992); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c) (2006) (stating a "motion to reopen proceedings shall not be granted unless it appears to the Board that evidence sought to be offered is material and was not available and could not have been discovered or presented at the former hearing."). The decision will not be reversed absent abuse of discretion. Stewart v. INS, 181 F.3d 587, 595 (4th Cir. 1999).

We find no abuse of discretion in the Board's finding that Orozco failed to show she was prejudiced by counsel's conduct. We also find no due process violation. As a result, we deny the petition 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.

PETITION DENIED