

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-2305**

---

MEHDI KHAN,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals  
(A72-167-476)

---

Submitted: May 30, 2007

Decided: July 10, 2007

---

Before GREGORY and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Richard W. Chang, WASSERMAN, MANCINI & CHANG, Washington, D.C., for  
Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Mary  
Jane Candaux, Senior Litigation Counsel, Anh-Thu P. Mai, Office of  
Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mehdi Khan, a native and citizen of Pakistan, petitions for review an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying his motion to reconsider and/or reopen. Insofar as Khan challenges the Board's prior orders, we lack jurisdiction because Khan did not file a timely petition for review from those orders. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1) (2000); Stone v. INS, 514 U.S. 386, 405 (1995). While Khan's brief raises challenges to both of those prior orders, he fails to raise any issue with respect to the November 14, 2006, order, the only order from which his petition for review is timely. Issues not briefed on appeal are deemed abandoned. Pleasurecraft Marine Engine Co. v. Thermo Power Corp., 272 F.3d 654, 657 (4th Cir. 2001); 11126 Baltimore Blvd. v. Prince George's County, Md., 58 F.3d 988, 993 n.7 (4th Cir. 1995) (relying on Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(6) and holding that issues not briefed or argued in federal appeal are deemed abandoned). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review.

We note the Board did not abuse its discretion denying Khan's motion to reconsider or reopen. Jean v. Gonzales, 435 F.3d 475, 481 (4th Cir. 2006); Stewart v. INS, 181 F.3d 587, 595 (4th Cir. 1999).

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