

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 22 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ARTEMIO NAVA TORRES,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 24-4400

Agency No.
A206-466-525

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 20, 2025**
Phoenix, Arizona

Before: TALLMAN, BADE, and LEE, Circuit Judges.

Artemio Nava-Torres, a native and citizen of Mexico, seeks review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' (BIA) dismissal of his appeal of an Immigration Judge's (IJ) determination that he failed to demonstrate necessary hardship to merit cancellation of his removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252, and 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).

deny the petition.

We review the BIA’s legal conclusions de novo. *Bringas-Rodriguez v. Sessions*, 850 F.3d 1051, 1059 (9th Cir. 2017).

Nava-Torres, who was represented by counsel, failed to file a brief to the BIA and instead presented his grounds for appeal only in a cursory notice of appeal. That notice of appeal does not provide “sufficient specificity” to prevent the BIA from needing to “search through the record and speculate on what possible errors the petitioner claims.” *Rojas-Garcia v. Ashcroft*, 339 F.3d 814, 819–20 (9th Cir. 2003) (citation modified). Nava-Torres thereby waived any argument contesting the IJ’s determination. *See Nolasco-Amaya v. Garland*, 14 F.4th 1007, 1013 (9th Cir. 2021) (discussing circumstances in which this court has denied review of the BIA’s summary dismissal of an appeal). The BIA’s dismissal was therefore proper.

PETITION DENIED.