

FEB 15 2008

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SEREFINO RENDON DIAZ; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-73436

Agency Nos. A79-534-311
A79-534-312

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 11, 2008**

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY and RYMER, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA")
order denying petitioners' 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 finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

07-73436

Petitioners have paid the filing fee for this petition for review. Accordingly, the court's September 5, 2007 order is discharged.

We review the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. *See Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002). The regulations state that a motion to reopen removal proceedings must be filed no later than ninety days after the date on which the final administrative decision was rendered in the proceeding sought to be reopened. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2). A review of the administrative record demonstrates that the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reopen as untimely. Petitioners' final administrative order of removal was entered on June 17, 2005. Petitioners' motion to reopen was filed on June 4, 2007, more than ninety days after the date on which the final order of removal was entered. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2).

Accordingly, respondent's unopposed motion for summary disposition is granted because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam).

The motion for stay of voluntary departure, filed after the departure period had expired, is denied. *See Garcia v. Ashcroft*, 368 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2004).

07-73436

All other pending motions are denied as moot. The temporary stay of removal confirmed by Ninth Circuit General Order 6.4(c) shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.