

JAN 10 2008

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>GLORIA MENDOZA ESPINOZA; et al.,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 07-70030

Agency Nos. A95-315-334
A95-315-335

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted January 7, 2008 **

Before: O’SCANNLAIN, SILVERMAN and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals’
 (“BIA”) denial of a motion to reopen.

Respondent’s unopposed motion for summary disposition is granted
because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not

* 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).

07-70030

to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard). The regulations provide that “a party may file only one motion to reopen,” and the motion “must be filed no later than 90 days after the date on which the final administrative decision was rendered in the proceeding sought to be reopened.” 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2). The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen as untimely where it was filed almost two years after the final administrative decision was rendered. *See Ordonez v. INS*, 345 F.3d 777, 782 (9th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, this petition for review is denied.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.