

JUN 16 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>LUIS MEDINA-PRIAZ,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>

No. 13-70357

Agency No. A088-719-167

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 12, 2014**

Before: McKEOWN, WARDLAW, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Luis Medina-Priaz, 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 his motion for a continuance of his removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de

* 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).

novo questions of law, including constitutional claims. *Sandoval-Luna v. Mukasey*, 526 F.3d 1243, 1246 (9th Cir. 2008) (per curiam). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA applied the correct legal standard and provided a reasoned explanation for its decision denying Medina-Priaz’s motion for a two-year continuance to await the passage of immigration-reform legislation, where the BIA invoked the applicable “good cause” legal standard and cited pertinent legal authorities. *See Singh v. Holder*, 638 F.3d 1264, 1274 (9th Cir. 2011) (“[A]n IJ ‘may grant a motion for continuance for good cause shown.’” (citation omitted)); *see also Mendez-Castro v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 975, 980 (9th Cir. 2009) (concluding that the agency applied the correct legal standard in a case where the agency “expressly cited and applied [relevant case law] in rendering its decision, which is all our review requires”).

The record belies Medina-Priaz’s contention that the BIA violated due process by failing to address his due process claim.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.