

JUL 19 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RAMON BEDOLLA-ZAVALA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 08-70910

Agency No. A095-271-440

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.

Ramon Bedolla-Zavala, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order summarily affirming his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) removal order. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law, *Cerezo v.*

* 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).

Mukasey, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), and we dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to consider Bedolla-Zavala's contentions related to his eligibility for a section 212(h) waiver because he failed to raise them before the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (petitioner's failure to raise an issue to the BIA generally constitutes a failure to exhaust, and a due process challenge must be exhausted when it involves a procedural error).

We also lack jurisdiction to review the IJ's discretionary denial of voluntary departure. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229c(f), 1252(a)(2)(B)(i).

Bedolla-Zavala's contention that the BIA's streamlined order did not set forth adequate reasons for denying relief is foreclosed by *Falcon Carriche v. Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 851 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.