

JAN 05 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>CRISTOBAL ACOSTA-ARIEGA; MARIA ZEPEDA-ZARAGOZA,</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. 06-71658

Agency Nos. A095-118-887
A079-653-105

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.

Cristobal Acosta-Ariega and Maria Zepeda-Zaragoza, husband and wife and natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's

* 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).

decision denying their applications for cancellation of removal. We dismiss the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency’s discretionary determination that petitioners failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005).

Petitioners’ contention that the agency deprived them of due process by misapplying the law to the facts of their case does not state a colorable due process claim. *See id.* (“[t]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.”); *see also Sanchez-Cruz v. INS*, 255 F.3d 775, 779 (9th Cir. 2001) (holding that the “misapplication of case law” may not be reviewed).

Petitioners’ remaining contention is unavailing.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.