

MAR 23 2012

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JOSE JUAREZ-CONTRERAS,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 07-71517

Agency No. A092-455-767

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted March 6, 2012**

Before: B. FLETCHER, REINHARDT, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Jose Juarez-Contreras, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying his motion to reopen.

Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law and we review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Iturribarria v. INS, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Juarez-Contreras' motion to reopen as untimely because it was filed over three years after the final order of removal, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Juarez-Contreras did not establish he acted with due diligence required for equitable tolling, *see Singh v. Gonzales*, 491 F.3d 1090, 1096-97 (9th Cir. 2007).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Juarez-Contreras' contentions regarding the BIA's October 7, 2003, order denying his appeal of the immigration judge's decision, because this petition for review is not timely as to that order. *See Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.