

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-2135**

---

ENNIO MANOLO DE LEON ESTRADA,

Petitioner,

versus

JULIE L. MYERS, Assistant Secretary; ALBERTO  
R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondents.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration  
Appeals. (A96-794-351; A73-524-000)

---

Submitted: May 4, 2007

Decided: June 6, 2007

---

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Linda A. Dominguez, L A DOMINGUEZ LAW, LLC, Baltimore, Maryland,  
for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Papu  
Sandhu, Senior Litigation Counsel, Daniel J. Davis, UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondents.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ennio Manolo De Leon Estrada, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions for review of the reinstatement of an order of deportation entered in 1995. Soon after his deportation, Estrada illegally reentered the United States. Estrada was arrested in 2006 during an interview regarding his application for adjustment of status. The prior order of deportation was reinstated pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5) (2000), 8 C.F.R. § 1241.8 (2006). Estrada seeks review of this order.

Under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5), the Attorney General may reinstate a prior order of removal from its original date, and the order "is not subject to being reopened or reviewed . . . ." Our examination of the record convinces us that this statute was properly applied to Estrada. See Fernandez-Vargas v. Gonzales, 126 S. Ct. 2422, 2425 (2006) (holding § 1231(a)(5) has no improper retroactive effect when applied to an alien who was deported and who illegally returned before the effective date of the statute); Velasquez-Gabriel v. Crocetti, 263 F.3d 102, 108-10 (4th Cir. 2001) (same). Therefore, under the plain language of the statute, we lack jurisdiction to review the reinstated order of removal.

We deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED