

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 20 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

VALDEMAR SALAS-BUENROSTRO,

No. 16-73762

Petitioner,

Agency No. A090-343-309

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

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.

Valdemar Salas-Buenrostro, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen deportation proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen and review de novo

---

\* 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).

questions of law. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005).

We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not err or abuse its discretion in denying Salas-Buenrostro's motion to reopen his 1996 deportation proceedings. Because he did not demonstrate his 2005 removal order was invalid, the BIA did not err in declining to address, and we need not address, Salas-Buenrostro's contentions regarding whether his 1996 deportation order remained valid. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (court and agency not required to make findings on issues unnecessary to the results they reach); *Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 991 (9th Cir. 2010) (remand to agency unnecessary where to do so would be futile).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**