

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-1647**

---

HUI RONG ZHENG,

Petitioner,

v.

MATTHEW G. WHITAKER, Acting Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: January 31, 2019

Decided: February 15, 2019

---

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

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Theodore N. Cox, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Joseph H. Hunt, Assistant Attorney General, Jonathan A. Robbins, Senior Litigation Counsel, Yanal H. Yousef, Trial Attorney, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Hui Rong Zheng, a native and citizen of the People’s Republic of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“Board”) denying her motion to reopen. We denied Zheng’s petition for review from the Board’s order dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge’s order denying her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. *See Zheng v. Sessions*, 721 F. App’x 277 (4th Cir. 2018) (No. 17-2123). We found that the adverse credibility finding was supported by substantial evidence. *Id.* at 277-78. Insofar as Zheng again challenges the Board’s adverse credibility finding, we lack jurisdiction because Zheng’s petition for review is only effective from the Board’s order denying reopening. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1) (2012) (noting that petition for review must be filed within 30 days of the order being reviewed); *Stone v. INS*, 514 U.S. 386, 405 (1995) (stating that 30-day time period is jurisdictional).

We review the denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2018); *see INS v. Doherty*, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992); *Mosere v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 397, 400 (4th Cir. 2009). The “denial of a motion to reopen is reviewed with extreme deference, given that motions to reopen are disfavored because every delay works to the advantage of the deportable alien who wishes merely to remain in the United States.” *Sadhvani v. Holder*, 596 F.3d 180, 182 (4th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted). We reverse a denial of a motion to reopen only if it is “arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law.” *Mosere*, 552 F.3d at 400 (internal quotation

marks omitted). We have reviewed the record and the Board's order and conclude that there was no abuse of discretion.

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*