

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 25 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MA TRINIDAD TERRONES ALONSO,

No. 24-6181

Petitioner,

Agency No.

A213-053-018

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted July 15, 2025\*\*

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

Ma Trinidad Terrones Alonso, native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order summarily dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ’s”) decision denying her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

---

\* 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).

review for abuse of discretion the BIA’s summary dismissal of an appeal. *Nolasco-Amaya v. Garland*, 14 F.4th 1007, 1012 (9th Cir. 2021). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in summarily dismissing Terrones Alonso’s appeal where the notice of appeal did not identify specific challenges to the IJ’s decision, and where she did not file a separate compliant written brief despite stating that she would. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(2)(i)(A), (E); *see also Singh v. Ashcroft*, 361 F.3d 1152, 1157 (9th Cir. 2004) (summary dismissal appropriate where notice of appeal lacked sufficient specificity and no separate written brief was filed). Terrones Alonso’s contention that the BIA did not provide an adequately reasoned opinion is unsupported by the record.

We do not address Terrones Alonso’s contentions as to the merits of her claims because the BIA did not deny relief on these grounds. *See Santiago-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 657 F.3d 820, 829 (9th Cir. 2011) (“In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

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

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**