

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 2 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JORGE BARROSO-VARGAS,

No. 16-70841

Petitioner,

Agency No. A096-474-071

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

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.

Jorge Barroso-Vargas, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying cancellation of removal and denying his motion to remand. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

---

\* 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 review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to remand. *Romero-Ruiz v. Mukasey*, 538 F.3d 1057, 1062 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency's denial of cancellation of removal for failure to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative, and Barroso-Vargas does not raise a colorable legal or constitutional claim that would invoke our jurisdiction. *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 hardship determination).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Barroso-Vargas' motion to remand because the BIA considered the evidence that he submitted and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to establish prima facie eligibility for cancellation of removal. *See Singh v. INS*, 295 F.3d 1037, 1039 (9th Cir. 2002) (The BIA's denial of a motion to reopen shall be reversed only if it is "arbitrary, irrational or contrary to law.").

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.**