

JAN 17 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARIA DE LOURDES ARROYO-  
LOEZA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 11-72881

Agency No. A077-410-341

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted January 15, 2013\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, BEA, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Maria De Lourdes Arroyo-Loeza, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying her application for cancellation of

---

\* 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).

removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s continuous physical presence determination, *Ibarra–Flores v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 614, 618 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Arroyo-Loeza failed to establish the ten years of continuous physical presence required for cancellation of removal. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1)(A); *Juarez-Ramos v. Gonzales*, 485 F.3d 509, 511 (9th Cir. 2007) (expedited removal interrupts an alien’s continuous physical presence for cancellation purposes).

We lack jurisdiction to review Arroyo-Loeza’s collateral attack on her expedited removal. *Avendano-Ramirez v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 813, 818-19 (9th Cir. 2004); *see also Valadez-Munoz v. Holder*, 623 F.3d 1304, 1306 (9th Cir. 2010) (defining expedited removal as a “formal proceeding”).

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