

JUN 07 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>PEIKUN WU,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 07-75125

Agency No. A098-471-799

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 25, 2010**

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

Peikun Wu, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”), and denying his motion

* 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).

to remand based on ineffective assistance of counsel. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to remand, *Movsisian v. Ashcroft*, 395 F.3d 1095, 1098 (9th Cir. 2005), and review de novo questions of law, including claims of due process violations due to ineffective assistance of counsel, *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

Wu has not raised, and therefore waives, any challenge to the BIA's dismissal of his asylum, withholding of removal and CAT claims. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Wu's motion to remand because Wu failed to establish prejudice from his former counsel's representation. *See Rojas-Garcia v. Ashcroft*, 339 F.3d 814, 826 (9th Cir. 2003) (to prevail on an ineffective assistance of counsel claim a petitioner must demonstrate prejudice).

We reject Wu's remaining contentions.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.