

MAR 01 2016

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  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

CARLOS ALBERTO RIVAS-CANAS,  
AKA Carlos A. Canas,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 14-72418

Agency No. A205-311-538

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 24, 2016\*\*

Before: LEAVY, FERNANDEZ, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

Carlos Alberto Rivas-Canas, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying a continuance. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of

---

\* 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).

a motion for a continuance, and review de novo claims of due process violations. *Sandoval-Luna v. Mukasey*, 526 F.3d 1243, 1246 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Rivas-Canas' request for a seventh continuance for failure to demonstrate good cause, where Rivas-Canas had been granted previous continuances, failed to file any applications for relief by the IJ's deadlines, and failed to provide sufficient evidence of eligibility for relief. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.29; *Ahmed v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 1009, 1012 (9th Cir. 2009) (“When reviewing an IJ’s denial of a continuance, we consider a number of factors, including: (1) the nature of the evidence excluded as a result of the denial of the continuance, (2) the reasonableness of the immigrant’s conduct, (3) the inconvenience to the court, and (4) the number of continuances previously granted.” (citations omitted)).

Rivas-Canas' contention that the BIA violated due process by failing to provide a reasoned explanation for its decision is belied by the record.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**