

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-1832**

---

SHOW WEN LIN, a/k/a Xi-Wen Lin; HONG WEI LIN, a/k/a Kotaro Ono,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: March 27, 2012

Decided: April 2, 2012

---

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Margaret Wong, MARGARET WONG & ASSOCIATES, CO., LLP, Cleveland, Ohio, for Petitioners. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Ada E. Bosque, Senior Litigation Counsel, Brianne Whelan Cohen, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Show Wen Lin, and her husband, Hong Wei Lin, natives and citizens of the People's Republic of China (collectively "Petitioners"), petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") denying their motion to reopen. Because the Petitioners fail to raise any arguments that meaningfully challenge the propriety of the Board's denial of their motion to reopen in the argument section of their brief, we find that they have failed to preserve any issues for review. See Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A) ("[T]he argument . . . must contain . . . appellant's contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies."); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) ("Failure to comply with the specific dictates of [Rule 28] with respect to a particular claim triggers abandonment of that claim on appeal."). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Show Wen Lin (B.I.A. Jul. 7, 2011).<sup>\*</sup> We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

---

<sup>\*</sup> We lack jurisdiction to review the Board's refusal to exercise its authority to sua sponte reopen proceedings. See Mosere v. Mukasey, 552 F.3d 397, 400-01 (4th Cir. 2009).

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED