## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

|   | No. 17-1368                            |   |               |
|---|--|---|---------------|
| PETER KINYANJUI,  |  |   |               |
| Petitioner,   |  |   |               |
| v.  |  |   |               |
| JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, A  | ttorney General,                       |   |               |
| Respondent.   |  |   |               |
|   |  |   |               |
| On Petition for Review of   | an Order of the Boar                   | d of Immigration App                      | eals.         |
| Submitted: September 18, 2017   |  | Decided: Octo                             | ber 12, 2017  |
| Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a  | and KEENAN and T                       | HACKER, Circuit Jud                       | ges.          |
| Petition denied in part and dismisse  | ed in part by unpubli                  | shed per curiam opinio                    | on.           |
| Japheth N. Matemu, MATEMU<br>Petitioner. Chad A. Readler, Actin<br>Director, Lindsay Corliss, Offi<br>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, W. | g Assistant Attorney ce of Immigration | General, John S. Hog<br>Litigation, UNITE | an, Assistant |
| •   |  |   |               |

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Peter Kinyanjui, a native and citizen of Kenya, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denying his motion to reopen as untimely and declining to apply equitable tolling. We have reviewed the administrative record and the Board's order and find no abuse of discretion. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2017). We therefore deny the petition for review in part for the reasons stated by the Board. *See In re Kinyanjui* (B.I.A. Feb. 28, 2017).

We lack jurisdiction to review the Board's refusal to exercise its sua sponte authority to reopen and therefore dismiss this portion of the petition for review. *See Lawrence v. Lynch*, 826 F.3d 198, 206-07 (4th Cir. 2016); *Mosere v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 397, 400-01 (4th Cir. 2009). 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.

DENIED IN PART; DISMISSED IN PART