

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-1054

ANA MARIA FRANCO-SAGASTUME; C.R.G.F.,

Petitioners,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: August 21, 2020

Decided: September 2, 2020

Before KEENAN, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Luis C. Diaz, LAW OFFICES OF LUIS C. DIAZ, LLC, Silver Spring, Maryland, for
Petitioners. Joseph H. Hunt, Assistant Attorney General, Cindy S. Ferrier, Assistant
Director, Micah Engler, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED
STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ana Maria Franco-Sagastume and her minor son petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge's decision denying their motion to reopen and rescind the previously entered in absentia orders of removal. We deny the petition for review.

We review the denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(3) (2020); *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 will 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).

After considering the Petitioners' arguments, we conclude that the Board did not abuse its discretion in dismissing the Petitioners' appeal. 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