

JUL 31 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>YUN KYU YOOK; SUN JU YOOK; JU SUN YOOK; JU HYUNG YOOK,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>

No. 06-72321

Agency Nos. A072-983-857
A072-983-858
A072-983-859
A072-983-860

MEMORANDUM *

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

Submitted July 29, 2009**

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Yun Kyu Yook and her three children, natives and citizens of South Korea,
petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' orders dismissing their

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

appeals from an immigration judge's order of removal. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252, and we deny the petition.

We reject petitioners' contention that the government failed to establish removability by clear and convincing evidence, because petitioners conceded removability. *See Shin v. Mukasey*, 547 F.3d 1019, 1024 (9th Cir. 2008).

We also reject petitioners' contention that the government should be equitably estopped from ordering their removal. Although a government employee, Leland Sustaire, issued petitioners' fraudulent alien registration cards, the record shows Yun Kyu Yook was not "ignorant of the true facts" when she procured the cards, *see id.* at 1025, and "[i]n any event, estoppel against the government is unavailable where petitioners have not lost any rights to which they were entitled." *Sulit v. Schiltgen*, 213 F.3d 449, 454 (9th Cir. 2000).

Finally, we find no defects amounting to a due process violation. *See Shin*, 547 F.3d at 1024-25; *Hong v. Mukasey*, 518 F.3d 1030, 1035-36 (9th Cir. 2008).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.