

MAR 01 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>BERNARDO PERFECTO-CORNELIO,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 10-72363

Agency No. A093-237-450

MEMORANDUM\*

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

February 21, 2012\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, McKEOWN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Bernardo Perfecto-Cornelio, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying his motion to reopen based on ineffective assistance of counsel. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review 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 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Perfecto-Cornelio's motion to reopen because he presented insufficient evidence to establish prejudice. *See Rojas-Garcia v. Ashcroft*, 339 F.3d 814, 826 (9th Cir. 2003) (to prevail on an ineffective assistance of counsel claim, petitioner must demonstrate prejudice).

We lack jurisdiction to review Perfecto-Cornelio's remaining contentions because he failed to exhaust these issues before the BIA. *Zara v. Ashcroft*, 383 F.3d 927, 930-31 (9th Cir. 2004) ("A petitioner cannot satisfy the exhaustion requirement by making a general challenge to the IJ's decision, but, rather, must specify which issues form the basis of the appeal.")

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