

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-2464

VLADIMIR BONCHEV ZLATANOV,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: July 15, 2019

Decided: July 24, 2019

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nicolette Glazer, LAW OFFICES OF LARRY R. GLAZER, Century City, California, for Petitioner. Joseph H. Hunt, Assistant Attorney General, Song Park, Acting Assistant Director, Corey L. Farrell, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Vladimir Bonchev Zlatanov, a native and citizen of Bulgaria, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denying Zlatanov's second motion to reopen. We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

We conclude that the Board did not abuse its discretion by denying reopening based on Zlatanov's argument that he did not receive adequate notice of the April 10, 2008, hearing or based on changed circumstances. *See Mosere v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 397, 400 (4th Cir. 2009) (stating standard of review). Accordingly, we deny in part the petition for review.

We further conclude that we are without jurisdiction to review Zlatanov's due process claim because he did not raise the issue before the Board. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (2012); *Ramirez v. Sessions*, 887 F.3d 693, 700 (4th Cir. 2018) (noting court lacks jurisdiction to review "bases for relief" not raised before the Board). We are also without jurisdiction to review the Board's decision denying sua sponte reopening. *Lawrence v. Lynch*, 826 F.3d 198, 206 (4th Cir. 2016). Accordingly, we dismiss in part the petition for review.

We deny in part and dismiss in part 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 IN PART;
DISMISSED IN PART*