

JUL 16 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

KULJIT KAUR; JASMINE KAUR;  
JASKARAN SINGH,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-70734

Agency Nos. A055-719-419

A055-719-420

A055-719-421

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted June 29, 2010\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, LEAVY, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Kuljit Kaur and her children, natives and citizens of India, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order 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 concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying their motion for a continuance of removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion for a continuance, *Ahmed v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 1009, 1012 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners’ August 10, 2005, request for a further continuance because both the BIA and the IJ offered reasoned bases for the denial, and petitioners did not establish that a further continuance would benefit their pursuit of relief from removal. *See Singh v. INS*, 213 F.3d 1050, 1052 (9th Cir. 2000) (agency abuses discretion when it acts “arbitrarily, irrationally, or contrary to law”) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted); *see also Ahmed*, 569 F.3d at 1012 (evaluating, among other factors, the nature of evidence excluded as a result of the denial of the continuance, the reasonableness of the immigrant’s conduct, and the reasoned bases of the agency’s denial).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**

