

FEB 23 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARIO LLAMAS-GUTIERREZ;  
CRISTINA LLAMAS, a.k.a. Maria  
Cristina Llamas,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-72865

Agency Nos. A072-172-348  
A072-172-380

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 15, 2011\*\*

Before: CANBY, FERNANDEZ, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Mario Llamas-Gutierrez and Cristina Llamas, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their applications for

---

\* 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).

cancellation of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law. *Altamirano v. Gonzales*, 427 F.3d 586, 591 (9th Cir. 2005). We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to consider petitioners' contentions that they did not knowingly and voluntarily consent to their August 23, 1998, expedited removal orders, because it would require us to "nullify the continuing effects of [those] order[s]," which 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(A) bars. *Avendano-Ramirez v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 813, 818-19 (9th Cir. 2004).

Because the agency correctly determined that the expedited removal orders precluded petitioners from establishing the continuous physical presence required for cancellation of removal, *see Juarez-Ramos v. Gonzales*, 485 F.3d 509, 512 (9th Cir. 2007), we need not reach their remaining contentions.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**