

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-2186**

---

IRINA YUROVA; GENADI YUROV,

Petitioners,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: June 12, 2015

Decided: June 18, 2015

---

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Philip R. Kuhn, BRIDGEHOUSELAW, LLP, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Petitioners. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, John W. Blakeley, Assistant Director, Kate D. Balaban, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Irina Yurova and her husband, Genadi Yurov, natives and citizens of Uzbekistan, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals denying their motion to reconsider. We deny the petition for review.

The Petitioners had 30 days from the May 28, 2014, order to timely file a petition for review. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1) (2012). This time period is "jurisdictional in nature and must be construed with strict fidelity to [its] terms." Stone v. INS, 514 U.S. 386, 405 (1995). The filing of a motion to reopen or reconsider with the Board does not toll or otherwise extend the 30-day period for seeking review of the underlying order. Id. at 394. A petition for review from the denial of a motion to reopen or reconsider, if it is not timely as to the underlying removal order, does not bestow jurisdiction to review the final order of removal. See Jin Ming Liu v. Gonzales, 439 F.3d 109, 111 (2d Cir. 2006). Yurova's October 30, 2014, petition for review is only timely as to the September 30, 2014, order denying reconsideration.

The denial of a motion to reconsider is reviewed for abuse of discretion. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2015); Narine v. Holder, 559 F.3d 246, 249 (4th Cir. 2009). A motion to reconsider asserts the Board made an error in its earlier decision and "shall state the reasons for the motion by specifying the errors

of fact or law in the prior Board decision and shall be supported by pertinent authority." 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1) (2015). We will reverse a denial of a motion to reconsider "only if the Board acted arbitrarily, irrationally, or contrary to law." Narine, 559 F.3d at 249 (internal quotation marks omitted).

We conclude the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reconsider. 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED