

AUG 16 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CAMILLA TELLUSELLE, a.k.a. Camilla  
Elizabeth Charpentier, a.k.a. C. Alexandra  
Telluselle, a.k.a. Camilla Alexandra  
Telluselle, a.k.a. Camilla A. Tuleselle,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-70149

Agency No. A200-864-839

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted August 14, 2013\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, GRABER, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Camilla Telluselle, a native and citizen of Sweden, petitions pro se for  
review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal

---

\* 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).

from an immigration judge's removal order. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings, and review de novo claims of due process violations. *Hamazaspyan v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 744, 747 (9th Cir. 2009). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's finding that Telluselle failed to maintain her F-1 nonimmigrant status where she testified that she was not enrolled at Hawaii Pacific University or any other educational institution during the spring 2011 semester. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(f)(5)(i) (describing requirements for maintaining foreign student status, including "pursuing a full course of study at an educational institution"). The agency therefore properly found Telluselle removable for failing to maintain her nonimmigrant status. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(1)(C)(i).

Telluselle's contention that she was denied due process during her removal proceedings is not supported by the record. *See Colmenar v. INS*, 210 F.3d 967, 971 (9th Cir. 2000) (due process claims require showing that proceedings were "so fundamentally unfair that the alien was prevented from reasonably presenting his case").

Telluselle failed to raise in her opening brief, and therefore waived, any challenges to the BIA's determination that she is not eligible for relief from

removal and to the BIA's denial of her motion to remand. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013) (a petitioner waives an issue by failing to raise it in the opening brief).

Telluselle's request that the court first review her civil lawsuit against Hawaii Pacific University or hold her case in abeyance pending the results of her appeal of the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Hawaii Pacific University is denied as moot. *See Telluselle v. Hawaii Pac. Univ.*, No. 12-17191 (9th Cir. June 17, 2013).

Telluselle's remaining contentions are unavailing.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**