UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-2209

CHUKWUEMEKE CHIKO AKWARA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General and Department of Homeland Security,

Respondent.

No. 11-1756

CHUKWUEMEKE CHIKO AKWARA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General, Department of Homeland Security,

Respondent.

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: March 13, 2012 Decided: July 20, 2012

Before WILKINSON and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Cynthia Groomes Katz, LAW OFFICES OF CYNTHIA A. GROOMES, P.C., Bethesda, Maryland, for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Luis E. Perez, Senior Litigation Counsel, Juria L. Jones, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

In these consolidated petitions for review, Chukwuemeke Chiko Akwara, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions for review of two separate orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board"). In No. 10-2209, the Board dismissed Akwara's appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his motion to reopen, and in No. 11-1756, the Board denied Akwara's motions to reconsider, to remand, for termination, and for administrative closure.

Because Akwara fails to raise any arguments that meaningfully challenge the propriety of the Board's dismissal of his appeal from the denial of his motion to reopen in the argument section of his brief, we find that he has failed to preserve any issues for review in No. 10-2209. 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 in No. 10-2209 for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Akwara (B.I.A. Sept. 27, 2010).

Turning to No. 11-1756, we have reviewed the administrative record and the Board's order and find that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying Akwara's motions. We therefore deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Akwara (B.I.A. June 23, 2011).

Accordingly, we deny both petitions 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.

PETITIONS DENIED