

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 28 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOSE ROLANDO RAMIREZ REYES,

No. 24-1573

Petitioner,

Agency No.

A205-513-890

v.

MEMORANDUM*

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted May 21, 2025**

Before: SILVERMAN, LEE, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Jose Rolando Ramirez Reyes, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against

* 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).

Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny the petition for review.

Ramirez Reyes does not challenge the agency’s determination that he failed to show he suffered harm that rose to the level of persecution, so we do not address it. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013).

Ramirez Reyes’s contentions that he has a well-founded fear of future persecution and is eligible for withholding of removal and CAT protection are not properly before the court because he did not raise them before the BIA. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (administrative remedies must be exhausted); *see also Santos-Zacaria v. Garland*, 598 U.S. 411, 417-19 (2023) (section 1252(d)(1) is not jurisdictional).

Thus, Ramirez Reyes’s asylum, withholding of removal, and CAT claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach Ramirez Reyes’s remaining contentions regarding the merits of his claims. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

We do not consider the materials Ramirez Reyes references in the opening brief that are not part of the administrative record. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 963-64 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.