

JUN 22 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WILFREDO ALVARADO-ALVARADO,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-73617

Agency No. A070-179-788

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 15, 2011**

Before: CANBY, O’SANNLAIN, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Wilfredo Alvarado-Alvarado, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his motion to reopen deportation proceedings conducted in absentia. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

* 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).

We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Alvarado-Alvarado's motion to reopen because he failed to show that personal service of his Order to Show Cause containing his hearing information was insufficient to provide him with notice of that hearing. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b) (repealed 1996). Additional notice provisions relevant to juveniles do not apply to Alvarado-Alvarado because he was not under eighteen years of age at the time the order was served. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 242.24 (1993); *see also Flores-Chavez v. Ashcroft*, 362 F.3d 1150, 1157 (9th Cir. 2004).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Alvarado-Alvarado's contention that the Order to Show Cause was invalidated by his lack of address because he did not raise that issue to the Board of Immigration Appeals. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004).

We do not consider Alvarado-Alvarado's remaining contentions because the denial of his motion to reopen is dispositive on all forms of relief sought.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.

