

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 15 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

GUILLERMO NEGRETE-RUIZ,

No. 16-73879

Petitioner,

Agency No. A099-512-302

v.

MEMORANDUM*

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted April 11, 2022**

Before: McKEOWN, CHRISTEN, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Guillermo Negrete-Ruiz, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his request for a continuance. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the

* 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).

denial of a continuance. *Ahmed v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 1009, 1012 (9th Cir. 2009).

We review de novo questions of law. *Bhattarai v. Lynch*, 835 F.3d 1037, 1042 (9th Cir. 2016). We deny the petition for review.

Negrete-Ruiz abandoned any challenge to the agency’s determination that he did not establish good cause for a continuance to allow him to marry and apply for adjustment of status through a spouse. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996) (“Issues raised in a brief that are not supported by argument are deemed abandoned.”).

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Negrete-Ruiz’s request for a continuance to allow him to marry and obtain a qualifying relative for purposes of cancellation of removal, because he did not demonstrate good cause. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.29; *Ahmed*, 569 F.3d at 1012 (factors to be considered in determining whether the denial of a continuance constitutes an abuse of discretion); *see also Hui Ran Mu v. Barr*, 936 F.3d 929, 936 (9th Cir. 2019) (“Although the [agency] did not expressly address the *Ahmed* factors, the IJ sufficiently outlined why good cause [for a continuance] did not exist.”). Negrete-Ruiz’s contentions that the agency erred in its legal analysis fail. *See Najmabadi v. Holder*, 597 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 2010) (agency adequately considered evidence and sufficiently announced its decision).

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.