

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 25-1818

Amarjit Singh; Manjit Kaur; Dripinder Singh

Petitioners

v.

Pamela Bondi, Attorney General of the United States

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted: December 19, 2025

Filed: January 8, 2026

[Unpublished]

Before BENTON, SHEPHERD, and KELLY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Amarjit Singh, Manjit Kaur, and Dripinder Singh, natives and citizens of India, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) denying their tenth motion to reopen their removal proceedings. The Singhs challenge the BIA's refusal to exercise its discretionary authority to reopen the removal proceedings sua sponte, but this court lacks jurisdiction to review the BIA's

decision absent a colorable constitutional claim. *See Manyary v. Bondi*, 129 F.4th 473, 479 (8th Cir. 2025); *Chong Toua Vue v. Barr*, 953 F.3d 1054, 1057–58 (8th Cir. 2020); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a). The Singhs’ argument that the BIA violated their due-process rights is not colorable. *See Manyary*, 129 F.4th at 479; *Essel v. Garland*, 89 F.4th 686, 689, 690 (8th Cir. 2023) (concluding that noncitizen who challenged the BIA’s refusal to sua sponte reopen proceedings to allow him to adjust status could not show any due-process violation because he had no protected liberty interest in how the BIA exercised a purely discretionary remedy); *Nativi-Gomez v. Ashcroft*, 344 F.3d 805, 808–09 (8th Cir. 2003) (holding that noncitizen has no protected liberty interest in the discretionary relief of adjustment of status).

The petition is dismissed. *See* 8th Cir. R. 47B.
