

JUN 03 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ENRIQUE CEJA-AMEZCUA, aka  
Enrique Ceja; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-70280

Agency Nos. A097-867-716  
A097-867-737

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted May 25, 2010\*\*  
San Francisco, California

Before: CANBY, THOMAS, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Enrique Ceja-Amezcuca and his wife Maria Del Carmen Vazquez, natives  
and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of 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).

Appeals' denial of their motion to reopen the underlying denial of their application for cancellation of removal based on their failure to establish the requisite hardship to their United States citizen children.

Petitioners introduced new evidence of hardship consisting of evidence that their son Enrique was recently diagnosed with depression and a skin condition. We conclude that the BIA properly considered the new evidence offered by petitioners, and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence did not establish extreme hardship, and was insufficient to warrant reopening. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2000) (the BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law").

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**