

MAY 17 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MIGUEL SANCHEZ-CHACOLLA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 10-71126

Agency No. A097-340-184

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 14, 2013**

Before: LEAVY, THOMAS, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Miguel Sanchez-Chacolla, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying pre-conclusion voluntary departure. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo

* 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).

claims of due process violations. *Rojas v. Holder*, 704 F.3d 792, 794 (9th Cir. 2012). We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency's denial of Sanchez-Chacolla's request for pre-conclusion voluntary departure. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B); *Rojas*, 704 F.3d at 794.

Sanchez-Chacolla's claim that the IJ exhibited bias or prejudice during his removal proceedings is not supported by the record. *See Rivera v. Mukasey*, 508 F.3d 1271, 1276 (9th Cir. 2007).

Contrary to Sanchez-Chacolla's contention, the BIA's decision adequately addressed his claim that his due process rights were violated. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) (the BIA "does not have to write an exegesis on every contention").

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.