United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

August 5, 2005

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

No. 04-60586 Summary Calendar

MARTIN JAQUEZ-VEGA,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals BIA No. A91 805 083

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, BENAVIDES, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:*

Martin Jaquez-Vega (Jaquez), a native and citizen of Mexico, seeks review of the Board of Immigration Appeal's (BIA) June 3, 2004, decision, which he states affirmed the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of his motion to reopen the removal proceedings. The BIA's June 3, 2004, decision, however, denied Jaquez's motion to reconsider. Jaquez offers no legal argument relevant to the BIA's denial of his motion to reconsider. Instead, Jaquez's brief is devoted to why the IJ erred in denying Jaquez's motion

^{*} Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

to reopen the removal proceedings and the BIA's January 28, 2004, affirmance of that denial. Jaquez did not file a petition for review from the denial of his motion to reopen the removal proceedings.

The BIA's denial of an appeal and its denial of a motion to reconsider are two separate final orders, each of which require their own petitions for review. <u>Stone v. INS</u>, 514 U.S. 386, 394 (1995). A timely petition for review is a jurisdictional requirement, and the lack thereof deprives this court of jurisdiction to review a decision of the BIA. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(1), (b)(1); <u>Karimian-Kaklaki v. INS</u>, 997 F.2d 108, 111 (5th Cir. 1993). Under <u>Stone</u>, this court is without jurisdiction to review the BIA's denial of Jaquez's motion to reopen the removal proceedings. <u>See Stone</u>, 514 U.S. at 394. Furthermore, by failing to brief any issue relative to the BIA's denial of his motion to reconsider, he has waived the only viable appellate issue. <u>See Rodriquez v. INS</u>, 9 F.3d 408, 414 n.15 (5th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, Jaquez's petition for review is DENIED.