

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-1989**

---

PAULINE ATONGMBA MATANGA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A97-196-139)

---

Submitted: April 4, 2008

Decided: April 21, 2008

---

Before MICHAEL and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James A. Roberts, LAW OFFICE OF JAMES A. ROBERTS, Falls Church, Virginia, for Petitioner. Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Emily Anne Radford, Assistant Director, Aviva L. Poczter, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Pauline Atongmba Matanga, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying her motion to reconsider the order affirming the immigration judge's order denying her applications for asylum, withholding from removal and withholding under the Convention Against Torture. We deny the petition for review.

We review the Board's decision to deny a motion to reconsider for abuse of discretion. INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992); see 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2007). A motion for reconsideration asserts the Board made an error in its earlier decision and requires the movant to specify the error of fact or law in the prior Board decision. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1) (2007); Matter of Cerna, 20 I. & N. Dec. 399, 402 (B.I.A. 1991) (noting that a motion to reconsider questions a decision for alleged errors in appraising the facts and the law). The burden is on the movant to establish that reconsideration is warranted. INS v. Abudu, 485 U.S. 94, 110 (1988). "To be within a mile of being granted, a motion for reconsideration has to give the tribunal to which it is addressed a reason for changing its mind." Ahmed v. Ashcroft, 388 F.3d 247, 249 (7th Cir. 2004). Motions that simply repeat contentions that have already been rejected are insufficient to convince the Board to reconsider a previous decision. Id.

We find the Board did not abuse its discretion. Matanga merely repeated in her motion to reconsider arguments raised on appeal. She also failed to show error in the Board's finding that she did not establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution.

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