

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 19 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JUAN JOSE MARTINEZ,

No. 13-71456

Petitioner,

Agency No. A095-737-543

v.

MEMORANDUM*

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted October 12, 2021**

Before: TALLMAN, RAWLINSON, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Juan Jose Martinez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se 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. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law.

* 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).

Padilla-Martinez v. Holder, 770 F.3d 825, 830 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not err in denying Martinez's application for cancellation of removal, where Martinez failed to meet his burden of proof to establish that his convictions do not render him ineligible for relief. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1)(B), (C); *see also Pereida v. Wilkinson*, 141 S. Ct. 754, 760 (2021) (applicant bears the burden of establishing eligibility for discretionary relief, including that he has not been convicted of certain disqualifying offenses).

In light of this disposition, we do not reach Martinez's contentions regarding the remaining factors for eligibility for cancellation of removal. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (the courts and the agency are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results).

The stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.