

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MAR 20 2018

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

JOSE LUIS PAREDES RAMIREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-71139

Agency No. A206-412-049

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted March 13, 2018**

Before: LEAVY, M. SMITH, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Jose Luis Paredes Ramirez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's denial of 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).

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency’s discretionary determination that Paredes Ramirez did not show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to his qualifying relatives. *See Vilchiz-Soto v. Holder*, 688 F.3d 642, 644 (9th Cir. 2012). Paredes Ramirez’s unsupported contentions that the agency did not address the effect his removal would have on his sons, allow him sufficient time to gather evidence, or consider his pro se and detained status, are not sufficiently colorable and thus do not invoke our jurisdiction. *See id.*; *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)); *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) (“What is required is merely that [the agency] 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 omitted)).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.