

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-2117

MANUEL RIVAS-BERRIOS; JACINTA CRUZ-BERRIOS,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-1771

MANUEL RIVAS-BERRIOS; JACINTA CRUZ-BERRIOS,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: April 8, 2010

Decided: May 12, 2010

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Timothy W. Davis, LAW OFFICE OF TIMOTHY W. DAVIS, LLC,
Baltimore, Maryland, for Petitioners. Tony West, Assistant
Attorney General, Ada E. Bosque, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jem
C. Sponzo, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Manuel Rivas-Berrios and Jacinta Cruz-Berrios, natives and citizens of El Salvador, have filed petitions for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") orders dismissing the appeal from the immigration judge's order and denying their motion to reopen. We deny the petitions for review.

We note that in their brief the Petitioners do not assert any challenge against the Board's order dismissing the appeal from the immigration judge's order. Accordingly, this court will not review that order. See Yousefi v. INS, 260 F.3d 318, 326 (4th Cir. 2001); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999). By virtue of their brief, the Petitioners limit review to the Board's order denying the motion to reopen.

This court reviews the denial of a motion to reopen for abuse of discretion. INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323 (1992); Sadhvani v. Holder, 596 F.3d 180, 182 (4th Cir. 2009). Motions to reopen "are disfavored . . . [because] every delay works to the advantage of the deportable alien who wishes merely to remain in the United States." Doherty, 502 U.S. at 323. The court will reverse the Board's decision only if it is "arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law." Sadhvani, 596 F.3d at 182.

Even if the Petitioners are found to have been in substantial compliance with the requirements under Matter of Lozada, 19 I. & N. Dec. 637 (BIA 1988), we find the Board did not abuse its discretion in finding they failed to show any prejudice.

Accordingly, we deny the 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