

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-2252**

---

KULJINDER SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition For Review of An Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

---

Submitted: April 17, 2018

Decided: May 2, 2018

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, DUNCAN, Circuit Judge, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kuljinder Singh, Petitioner Pro Se. Karen L. Melnik, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Kuljinder Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denying his motion to reconsider its dismissal of his appeal from the immigration judge’s denial of his asylum application.\* We review the Board’s denial of a motion for reconsideration for abuse of discretion, reversing “only if the Board acted arbitrarily, irrationally, or contrary to law.” *Urbina v. Holder*, 745 F.3d 736, 741 (4th Cir. 2014) (internal quotation marks omitted). In order to prevail, a movant must “specify[] the errors of fact or law in the prior Board decision,” rather than simply challenging the Board’s consideration of the evidence and the resulting decision. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1) (2017). Motions that merely repeat contentions that have already been rejected are insufficient to support reconsideration of a previous decision. *See Jean v. Gonzales*, 435 F.3d 475, 483 (4th Cir. 2006). Further, “a motion to reconsider . . . is ordinarily limited to the consideration of factual or legal errors in the disposition of issues previously raised.” *Martinez-Lopez v. Holder*, 704 F.3d 169, 172 (1st Cir. 2013) (collecting cases).

The Board did not abuse its discretion in denying Singh’s motion to reconsider, as Singh’s contentions were either already considered and rejected by the Board or first raised in Singh’s motion to reconsider. *See id.*; *Jean*, 435 F.3d at 483. Accordingly, we

---

\* To the extent that Singh also seeks review of the Board’s underlying order dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge’s decision, that order is not properly before us because Singh did not timely petition for review from that order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1) (2012); *Stone v. INS*, 514 U.S. 386, 394, 405 (1995).

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*