

AUG 10 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>WOONG SOON JANG; HEE SOON JANG,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
---

No. 06-72372

Agency Nos. A070-971-557  
A070-971-556

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.

Woong Soon Jang and Hee Soon Jang, natives and citizens of South Korea, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s removal order. Our jurisdiction is

---

\* 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).

governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We dismiss the petition for review as it applies to Woong Soon Jang in light of the BIA's December 7, 2010, order reopening and terminating his removal proceedings. *See Lopez-Ruiz v. Ashcroft*, 298 F.3d 886, 887 (9th Cir. 2002) (order).

We reject Hee Soon Jang's contention that the government failed to establish his removability by clear and convincing evidence, because he conceded removability. *See Young Sun Shin v. Mukasey*, 547 F.3d 1019, 1024 (9th Cir. 2008) (“[W]here the alien concedes removability, the government’s burden in this regard is satisfied.” (citation and quotation omitted)).

Hee Soon Jang's contention that the government should be equitably estopped from ordering his removal is unavailing. *See Sulit v. Schiltgen*, 213 F.3d 449, 454 (9th Cir. 2000) (“[E]stopper against the government is unavailable where petitioners have not lost any rights to which they were entitled.”); *cf. Salgado-Diaz v. Gonzalez*, 395 F.3d 1158, 1165-68 (9th Cir. 2005).

Hee Soon Jang's remaining contentions are not persuasive.

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