

JAN 27 2016

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

VICTOR NOEL SILLAS-IRIBE, AKA
Lerma Victor Urias,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 14-72715

Agency No. A205-714-613

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted January 20, 2016**

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Victor Noel Sillas-Irribé, 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 removal order. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C.

* 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).

§ 1252. We review de novo questions of law, *Vilchez v. Holder*, 682 F.3d 1195, 1198 (9th Cir. 2012), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA correctly concluded that Sillas-Irube’s conviction under California Health & Safety Code § 11350(a) is for a crime “relating to a controlled substance,” rendering him removable under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II), where the plea agreement refers to “Count 1: 11350(a)” and count 1 of the felony complaint specifies cocaine. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 812(c), sched. II(a)(4); *Coronado v. Holder*, 759 F.3d 977, 986 (9th Cir. 2014) (“Where the minute order or other equally reliable document specifies that a defendant pleaded guilty to a particular count of a criminal complaint, the court may consider the facts alleged in the complaint.”); *United States v. Torre-Jimenez*, 771 F.3d 1163, 1168-69 (9th Cir. 2014) (“the phrase ‘as charged in the Information (or Indictment)’ is not required where the documents are unambiguous”).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.