

NOV 26 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARIA DE JESUS ESTRADA PEDROZA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 12-74114

Agency No. A075-700-979

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 18, 2014**

Before: LEAVY, FISHER, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Maria de Jesus Estrada Pedroza, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying her motion to reopen removal proceedings held in absentia. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a

* 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).

motion to reopen. *Avagyan v. Holder*, 646 F.3d 672, 674 (9th Cir. 2011). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Estrada Pedroza's motion to reopen as untimely where it was filed more than 11 years after her removal order became final, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.23(b)(4)(ii), and Estrada Pedroza failed to demonstrate the due diligence required for equitable tolling of the filing deadline, *see Avagyan*, 646 F.3d at 679 (equitable tolling is available to a petitioner who is prevented from filing because of deception, fraud or error, and exercised due diligence in discovering such circumstances).

In her opening brief, Estrada Pedroza fails to raise, and therefore has waived, any challenge to the BIA's determination that she failed to establish a lack of notice of her hearing. *See Rizk v. Holder*, 629 F.3d 1083, 1091 n. 3 (9th Cir. 2011) (issues not raised in a petitioner's opening brief are deemed waived).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Estrada Pedroza's contention that her case warrants a favorable exercise of prosecutorial discretion. *See Vilchiz-Soto v. Holder*, 688 F.3d 642, 644 (9th Cir. 2012) (order).

In light of this disposition, we do not reach Estrada Pedroza's remaining contentions.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.