

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUN 30 2008

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

IDA ANWAR,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-73347

Agency No. A79-299-416

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 18, 2008**

Before: LEAVY, HAWKINS, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Ida Anwar, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order summarily affirming an Immigration Judge's ("IJ") order denying her motion to reopen removal

* 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).

proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo claims of constitutional violations in immigration proceedings. *See Ram v. INS*, 243 F.3d 510, 516 (9th Cir. 2001). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Anwar's challenge to the BIA's streamlining procedure is foreclosed by *Falcon Carriche v. Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 852 (9th Cir. 2003), and she does not demonstrate that the BIA's decision to streamline her particular case was improper.

In her opening brief Anwar fail to address, and therefore has waived any challenge to, the BIA's determination that she failed to demonstrate changed country conditions sufficient to merit reopening. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (holding issues which are not specifically raised and argued in a party's opening brief are waived).

We lack jurisdiction to review the IJ's order denying Anwar's underlying application for relief 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.