

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1780

ABDOULAYE MOMO CAMARA,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United
States,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration
Appeals. (A78-575-398)

Submitted: December 19, 2003

Decided: January 29, 2004

Before WIDENER, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Petition dismissed in part and denied in part by unpublished per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

Ana T. Jacobs, ANA T. JACOBS & ASSOCIATES, Washington, D.C., for
Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General,
Margaret J. Perry, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jennifer L.
Lightbody, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED
STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Abdoulaye Momo Camara, a native and citizen of Guinea, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denying his motion to reopen and reconsider its decision affirming the order of the immigration judge. Camara had sought asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture. To the extent that Camara attempts to challenge the Board's January 28, 2003 order affirming the decision of the immigration judge without opinion, Camara's failure to timely petition for review from that decision deprives us of jurisdiction to review such claims. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1) (2000); Stone v. INS, 514 U.S. 386, 394, 405 (1995).

Camara alleges to this court, as he did in his motion to reconsider, that the Board's retroactive application of procedural streamlining procedures to his appeal violated his rights. We rejected that argument in Khattak v. Ashcroft, 332 F.3d 250, 253 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, ___ U.S. ___, 72 U.S.L.W. 3282 (U.S. Dec. 1, 2003) (No. 03-521). Camara also disputes the Board's decision denying relief on his motion to reconsider. We have reviewed the record and the Board's order of May 28, 2003, and find that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion. See 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2003).

Accordingly, we dismiss in part and deny in part 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.

DISMISSED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART