

DEC 22 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JOSE GUADALUPE HUERTE DURAN; CASIMIRA CASA PENA,</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. 05-73324

Agency Nos. A075-621-937
A075-621-938

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted December 15, 2009**

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Jose Guadalupe Huerte Duran and Casimira Casa Pena, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to remand and dismissing their appeal from an immigration

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

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

judge's ("IJ") decision denying their applications for cancellation of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We dismiss the petition for review.

To the extent petitioners challenge the IJ's underlying decision, we lack jurisdiction to review the discretionary determination that petitioners failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative. *See Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 892 (9th Cir. 2003). We also lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's discretionary determination that the evidence of hardship petitioners submitted with their motion to remand was insufficient to establish a prima facie case for cancellation of removal. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 601, 603 (9th Cir. 2006).

Petitioners' contention that the BIA failed to adequately review the evidence are neither supported nor colorable. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) ("[T]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.").

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.