

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1522

MARU DABA BULESSA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: November 17, 2008

Decided: December 4, 2008

Before MICHAEL and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alan M. Parra, LAW OFFICE OF ALAN M. PARRA, ESQUIRE, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Assistant Attorney General, Carol Federighi, Senior Litigation Counsel, Brianne Whelan Cohen, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Maru Daba Bulessa, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of the order from the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's order denying his motion to reconsider the denial of his motion to reopen.

This court reviews the denial of Bulessa's motion for reconsideration for abuse of discretion. See Ogundipe v. Mukasey, 541 F.3d 257, 263 (4th Cir. 2008). A motion for reconsideration must specify the errors of law or fact in the previous decision and shall be supported by pertinent authority. See 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(6)(C) (2006); see also 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(2) (2008). We will reverse the Board's decision for abuse of discretion only if it is arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law. Barry v. Gonzales, 445 F.3d 741, 745 (4th Cir. 2006). "[A]dministrative findings of fact are conclusive unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to conclude to the contrary." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2006).

We find the Board did not abuse its discretion in affirming the immigration judge's order denying the motion to reconsider. We further note we do not have jurisdiction to review the Board's finding that there were no circumstances present warranting sua sponte reopening. See Tamenut v. Mukasey, 521 F.3d 1000, 1004 (8th Cir. 2008).

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