

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-1531**

---

ASSIONGBON JONAS FOLIVI; AKUVI FOLIVI-ANTHONY;  
DANIELE AYELE FOLIVI; MARTHE WILLIAMS A.  
FOLIVI,

Petitioners,

versus

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration  
Appeals. (A79-477-772)

---

Submitted: December 14, 2007

Decided: December 28, 2007

---

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Peter Nyoh, PETER NYOH & ASSOCIATES, Silver Spring, Maryland, for  
Petitioners. Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Acting Assistant Attorney  
General, Susan K. Houser, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jason Xavier  
Hamilton, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Assiongbon Jonas Folivi, a native and citizen of Togo, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying his motion to reopen. We deny the petition for review.

We review the Board's denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2007); INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992); Nibagwire v. Gonzales, 450 F.3d 153, 156 (4th Cir. 2006). A denial of a motion to reopen must be reviewed with extreme deference, since immigration statutes do not contemplate reopening and the applicable regulations disfavor motions to reopen. M.A. v. INS, 899 F.2d 304, 308 (4th Cir. 1990) (en banc). In explaining the degree of deference given to the agency's discretionary review, this court has observed that the decision to deny a motion to reopen "need only be reasoned, not convincing." Id. at 310 (quotation marks and citation omitted). We will reverse a denial of a motion to reopen only if the denial is "arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law." Barry v. Gonzales, 445 F.3d 741, 745 (4th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted), cert. denied, 127 S. Ct. 1147 (2007).

We find the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen. Accordingly, 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

---

\*We note Folivi has not challenged the Board's decision not to allow him to file a successive asylum application. "It is a well settled rule that contentions not raised in the argument section of the opening brief are abandoned." United States v. Al-Hamdi, 356 F.3d 564, 571 n.8 (4th Cir. 2004).