

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-2052

JEAN KOUASSI AZO; SIMONE AFIABI HOUNSOUNOU;
ULLANDA J C AZO; BADICHE C I AZO,

Petitioners,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, U.S. Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A76-418-281; A76-418-282; A76-418-284; A76-418-285)

Submitted: April 26, 2006

Decided: May 23, 2006

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition dismissed in part and denied in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ana T. Jacobs, ANA T. JACOBS & ASSOCIATES, P.C., Washington, D.C., for Petitioners. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Aviva L. Poczter, Senior Litigation Counsel, Dennis M. Wong, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Dublin, California, for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jean Kouassi Azo, and dependent petitioners Simone Afiavi Hounsounou, Ullanda Azo, and Badiche Azo, all natives and citizens of Benin, petition this court for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board). The Board adopted and affirmed the Immigration Judge's discretionary denial of adjustment of status, denied Azo's motion to reopen and reconsider his asylum claim, and rejected his motion to reopen based on ineffective assistance of counsel.

First, we have considered Azo's challenge to the discretionary denial of adjustment of status and conclude that we lack jurisdiction to review it. See 8 U.S.C.A. § 1252(a)(2)(B), (D) (West 2005); Higuit v. Gonzales, 433 F.3d 417, 419-20 (4th Cir. 2006). Next, we have reviewed the record and the Board's decision and find that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying Azo's motion to reopen and reconsider. See INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a) (2006). We thus affirm the denial of the motion for the reasons stated by the Board. See In Re: Azo, Nos. A76-418-281, A76-418-282, A76-418-284, A76-418-285 (B.I.A. Aug. 24, 2005).

We accordingly 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.

PETITION DISMISSED IN PART
AND DENIED IN PART