

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 20 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

IN KYUNG PAK,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 15-73074

Agency No. A038-662-918

MEMORANDUM *

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

Submitted April 11, 2017**

Before: GOULD, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

In Kyung Pak, a native and citizen of South Korea, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for cancellation of removal for legal permanent residents. We dismiss the petition for review.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency’s denial of cancellation of removal as a matter of discretion. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i); *Monroy v. Lynch*, 821 F.3d 1175, 1177-78 (9th Cir. 2016) (holding that petitioner did not raise a reviewable issue because “he simply disagrees with the agency’s weighing of his positive equities and the negative factors”).

Although the court would retain jurisdiction over colorable questions of law and constitutional claims, Pak’s contentions that the agency failed to consider or properly analyze relevant evidence, or apply the correct legal standard are not supported by the record and do not amount to colorable claims. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005). (“To be colorable in this context, . . . the claim must have some possible validity.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.