

JAN 20 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

HONARIO ARREDONDO-SICAIROS;
GUADALUPE ARREDONDO,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 06-74400

Agency Nos. A075-734-767
A075-734-768

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted January 13, 2009**

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, BYBEE, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Honario Arredondo-Sicairos and Guadalupe Arredondo, husband and wife
and natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of

* 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).

Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") orders denying their motion to reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for abuse of discretion, *Perez v. Mukasey*, 516 F.3d 770, 773 (9th Cir. 2008), we deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Petitioners' successive motion to reopen because the motion was numerically barred and failed to meet any regulatory exception. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1003.2(c)(2)-(3).

To the extent Petitioners seek review of the BIA's September 14, 2005 orders denying their first motion to reopen, we lack jurisdiction because the petition for review is not timely as to those orders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *Singh v. INS*, 315 F.3d 1186, 1188 (9th Cir. 2003). Moreover, those orders were the subject of *Arredondo-Sicairos v. Gonzales*, No. 05-75698 (9th Cir. May 8, 2006) (order).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.