

JUL 30 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOAO AVELINO MENESES PEDRO,  
a.k.a. John Pedro,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-73559

Agency No. A036-066-382

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted July 22, 2014\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, CANBY, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Joao Avelino Meneses Pedro, a native and citizen of Portugal, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. We dismiss the petition for review.

---

\* 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).

Meneses Pedro’s undisputed removability for an aggravated-felony conviction under 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(2)(A)(iii) limits our jurisdiction to colorable constitutional claims and questions of law. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(C)-(D); *see also Ghahremani v. Gonzales*, 498 F.3d 993, 998 n.5 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[W]ithdrawal of judicial review over final orders of deportation also withdraws jurisdiction from motions . . . to reopen deportation proceedings for those aliens deportable for having committed a crime enumerated in the statute.” (citation omitted)).

Meneses Pedro has failed to raise a colorable constitutional claim or question of law that would invoke our jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D). *See Mendez-Castro v. Mukasey*, 552 F.3d 975, 978 (9th Cir. 2009) (“To be colorable in this context, the [constitutional claim or question of law] need not be substantial, but the claim must have some possible validity.” (citation omitted)).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.**