

**OCT 10 2007**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**  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

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

VIRGINIA CORREA GUTIERREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,\*\* Acting Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-71655

Agency No. A70-817-327

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted: October 1, 2007 \*\*\*

Before: B. FLETCHER, BERZON and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

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

\*\* Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

\*\*\* This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

07-71655

We review this decision for an abuse of discretion. *See Ray v. Gonzalez*, 439 F.3d 582 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing *Singh v. Ashcroft*, 367 F. 3d 1182, 1185 (9th Cir. 2004)). We conclude that the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion for reconsideration because petitioner failed to demonstrate factual or legal errors warranting reconsideration.

Accordingly, respondent's 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) (stating standard).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**