

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1984

PATRICIA EKWOPI OSONG,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: March 19, 2013

Decided: March 28, 2013

Before KING, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randall L. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C., Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Luis E. Perez, Senior Litigation Counsel, Gary J. Newkirk, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Patricia Ekwopi Osong, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denying her motion to reopen as untimely and numerically barred. We have reviewed the administrative record and Osong's contentions, and conclude that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying her motion. See 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2012). We accordingly deny the petition for review in part for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Osong (B.I.A. July 13, 2012). We further find that we do not have jurisdiction to review Osong's claim that the Board abused its discretion in declining to reopen her removal proceedings sua sponte. See Mosere v. Mukasey, 552 F.3d 397, 400-01 (4th Cir. 2009). Likewise, we lack jurisdiction over her ineffective assistance of counsel claim because she failed to file a petition for review of the Board's order of September 12, 2011 addressing that claim. See Stone v. INS, 514 U.S. 386, 405 (1995). We therefore dismiss the petition for review in part with respect to these claims.

Accordingly, we deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

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

PETITION DENIED IN PART
AND DISMISSED IN PART