

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JAN 23 2014

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

JOSEFINA JUAREZ VILLANUEVA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-71840

Agency No. A075-643-695

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted January 21, 2014\*\*

Before: CANBY, SILVERMAN, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Josefina Juarez Villanueva, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying her motion to reopen proceedings based on ineffective assistance of counsel. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial 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).

a motion to reopen, and review de novo claims of due process violations.

*Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion because Juarez Villanueva failed to establish prejudice from the alleged ineffective assistance. *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). It follows that the BIA did not deny Juarez Villanueva due process in denying her motion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error and prejudice to prevail on a due process claim).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**