

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 26 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MARIO ALBERTO VERDUZCO-
GOMEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 24-3245

Agency No.
A095-759-541

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 18, 2025**

Before: CANBY, S.R. THOMAS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Mario Alberto Verduzco-Gomez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) order denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reopen.

* 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).

Najmabadi v. Holder, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Verduzco-Gomez does not challenge the BIA's determinations that his motion to reopen was untimely and that he did not establish any statutory or regulatory exception applies, so we do not address them. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013).

Our jurisdiction to review the BIA's discretionary decision not to reopen proceedings sua sponte is limited to contentions of legal or constitutional error. *See Lona v. Barr*, 958 F.3d 1225, 1227 (9th Cir. 2020). We find no legal or constitutional error on the face of the BIA's decision.

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.