

MAY 31 2016

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SAUL PEREZ-CORNEJO, AKA Saul
Perez,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 15-70535

Agency No. A092-500-703

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 24, 2016**

Before: REINHARDT, W. FLETCHER, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Saul Perez-Cornejo, 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 decision denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings.

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the

* 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).

denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The agency applied the correct legal standards and did not abuse its discretion in denying Perez-Cornejo's motion to reopen, where the agency considered both the positive and negative factors presented in his case and determined that he was not entitled to a favorable exercise of discretion. *See Zheng v. Holder*, 644 F.3d 829, 833 (9th Cir. 2011) (in determining whether to exercise its discretion in favor of a petitioner, the agency must consider "all relevant factors includ[ing] taking into account both negative and positive circumstances relevant to each [p]etitioner").

Perez-Cornejo's contention that the BIA failed to adequately explain its decision is not supported by the record. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) ("[The BIA] does not have to write an exegesis on every contention. What is required is merely that it 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)).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.