

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1289

TIBLTSE TEWOLDE,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: August 25, 2008

Decided: September 17, 2008

Before KING and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Goren, LAW OFFICE OF DAVID GOREN, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Assistant Attorney General, James E. Grimes, Senior Litigation Counsel, William C. Minick, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Tibltse Tewolde, a native and citizen of Eritrea, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying her motion to reopen. We deny the petition for review.

This court reviews the Board's denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2008); INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992); Nibagwire v. Gonzales, 450 F.3d 153, 156 (4th Cir. 2006). A denial of a motion to reopen must be reviewed with extreme deference. Stewart v. INS, 181 F.3d 587, 595 (4th Cir. 1999). We will reverse a denial of a motion to reopen only if the denial is "arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law." Barry v. Gonzales, 445 F.3d 741, 745 (4th Cir. 2006) (internal quotations and citation omitted). We have recognized three independent grounds for denial of a motion to reopen removal proceedings: "(1) the alien has not established a *prima facie* case for the underlying substantive relief sought; (2) the alien has not introduced previously unavailable, material evidence; and (3) where relief is discretionary, the alien would not be entitled to the discretionary grant of relief." Onyeme v. INS, 146 F.3d 227, 234 (4th Cir. 1998). In explaining the degree of deference given to the agency's discretionary review, this court has observed that the decision to deny a motion to reopen "need only be reasoned, not

convincing." M.A. v. INS, 899 F.2d 304, 310 (4th Cir. 1990) (en banc) (quotation marks and citation omitted).

The Board correctly denied the motion as untimely. See 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(7)(A), (C) (2006); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2) (2008). In addition, the Board did not abuse its discretion in finding Tewolde failed to show changed country conditions warranting reopening.

Accordingly, 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