

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCT 2 2017

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

OSCAR JESUS RODRIGUEZ-MORENO,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 15-72272

Agency No. A201-184-100

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 26, 2017\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Oscar Jesus Rodriguez-Moreno, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying cancellation of removal. 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).

Rodriguez-Moreno's contentions that the agency failed to consider his arguments on appeal, violated due process by mischaracterizing or failing to consider evidence, and failed to conduct a future-oriented analysis are not supported by the record, and do not amount to colorable claims that would invoke jurisdiction over the agency's hardship determination. *See Vilchiz-Soto v. Holder*, 688 F.3d 642, 644 (9th Cir. 2012) (absent a colorable legal or constitutional claim, the court lacks jurisdiction to review the agency's discretionary determination regarding hardship); *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 omitted)); *Larita-Martinez v. INS*, 220 F.3d 1092, 1095-96 (9th Cir. 2000) ("[A]n alien attempting to establish that the Board violated his right to due process by failing to consider relevant evidence must overcome the presumption that it did review the evidence.").

We lack jurisdiction to consider Rodriguez-Moreno's unexhausted contention that he was denied a full and fair hearing before the IJ. *See Tijani v. Holder*, 628 F.3d 1071, 1080 (9th Cir. 2010) (the court lacks jurisdiction to consider legal claims not presented in an alien's administrative proceedings before the BIA).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.**