

AUG 8 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JORGE L. AVALOS,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 10-72477

Agency No. A095-174-564

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 2, 2011**

Before: RYMER, IKUTA, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Jorge L. Avalos, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law, and for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to

* 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).

reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

To the extent that we have jurisdiction to review the BIA's denial of the motion to reopen, *see Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 601 (9th Cir. 2006), we conclude the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Avalos' motion to reopen based on new evidence of hardship because the BIA considered the evidence and acted within its broad discretion in determining the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening, *see Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational, or contrary to law.>").

The record further reflects that the BIA adequately addressed the evidence presented by Avalos' motion to reopen. *See Fernandez*, 439 F.3d at 603. Avalos' argument that the BIA failed to consider the new evidence in conjunction with prior evidence of hardship is not supported by the record.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.