

OCT 20 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

AUGUSTIN SANTOS-SANTOS,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 11-70650

Agency No. A099-460-473

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 14, 2015**

Before: SILVERMAN, BYBEE, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Augustin Santos-Santos, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny 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).

To the extent Santos-Santos presented non-cumulative evidence of hardship regarding his children's educational needs, the BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen where the evidence was insufficient to demonstrate any likely impact on the hardship determination in Santos-Santos's case. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 600 n.6 (9th Cir. 2006) (prima facie eligibility for relief is demonstrated where "the evidence reveals a reasonable likelihood that the statutory requirements for relief have been satisfied" (internal quotations omitted)).

Because the BIA's determination that Santos-Santos did not demonstrate a prima facie case for relief is dispositive, we do not reach his remaining contentions. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) ("As a general rule courts and agencies are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results they reach." (citation and quotation marks omitted)).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.