

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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>DURYOL KIM; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>

No. 06-72376

Agency Nos. A070-972-044
A070-972-045
A078-069-412

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.

Duryol Kim, Joung Hee Kim, and their daughter Hyun Jung Kim, natives and citizens of South Korea, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's removal order. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252, and we deny the petition for review.

* 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 reject petitioners' contention that the government failed to establish their removability by clear and convincing evidence, because petitioners 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)).

Petitioners' contention that the government should be equitably estopped from ordering their removal is unavailing. *See Sulit v. Schiltgen*, 213 F.3d 449, 454 (9th Cir. 2000) (“[E]stoppel 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).

Petitioners' remaining contentions are not persuasive.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.