

NOV 28 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MANUEL MURO CERVANTES,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 11-72749

Agency No. A035-878-554

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 18, 2014**

Before: LEAVY, FISHER, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Manuel Muro Cervantes, 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 application for cancellation of removal. We have jurisdiction under 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).

questions of law. *Cordoba v. Holder*, 726 F.3d 1106, 1113 (9th Cir. 2013). We deny the petition for review.

Contrary to Muro Cervantes' contention, the BIA sufficiently addressed his claim that his IJ proceedings were fundamentally unfair, where the BIA stated that it reviewed the arguments advanced on appeal and concluded that the IJ did not err in determining that Muro Cervantes failed to demonstrate that he warrants relief as a matter of discretion. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) (“What is required is merely that [the BIA] consider the issues raised, and announce its decision in terms sufficient to enable a reviewing court to perceive that it has heard and thought and not merely reacted.” (citation and quotation marks omitted)).

In addition, Muro Cervantes has not established that his proceedings before the IJ were fundamentally unfair or tainted by bias. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.10(b) (“[i]n deciding the individual cases before them, . . . immigration judges shall exercise their independent judgment and discretion”); *Rivera v. Mukasey*, 508 F.3d 1271, 1276 (9th Cir. 2007).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.