

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

September 16, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

---

No. 25-60026  
Summary Calendar

---

ADETOKUNBO ABOSEDE BROOKS,

*Petitioner,*

*versus*

PAMELA BONDI, *U.S. Attorney General,*

*Respondent.*

---

Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals  
Agency No. A028 988 727

---

Before KING, HAYNES, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Adetokunbo Aboosed Brooks, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) denying her motion to reconsider as untimely and, alternately, meritless. We review the denial of a motion “for reconsideration under a highly deferential abuse-of-discretion standard.” *Gonzalez Hernandez v. Garland*, 9 F.4th 278, 283

---

\* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-60026

(5th Cir. 2021). Pursuant to this standard, the BIA’s denial of a motion for reconsideration will stand “unless it is capricious, racially invidious, utterly without foundation in the evidence, or otherwise so irrational that it is arbitrary rather than the result of any perceptible rational approach.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

This standard has not been met. She shows no error in connection with the BIA’s timeliness determination. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(6)(B). Because this is an adequate basis on which to deny the petition as to her challenge to the BIA’s reconsideration decision, there is no need to consider her arguments concerning its merits. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976). Her due process arguments fail because she has no due process rights with respect to the discretionary remedy of reconsideration. *See Santos-Zacaria v. Garland*, 598 U.S. 411, 425 (2023); *Ramos-Portillo v. Barr*, 919 F.3d 955, 963 (5th Cir. 2019). Finally, insofar as her arguments are directed to the BIA’s initial affirmation of the Immigration Judge’s decision, we will not consider them because there is no outstanding petition for review from that decision. *See Ramos-Lopez v. Lynch*, 823 F.3d 1024, 1027 (5th Cir. 2016). The petition for review is DENIED.