

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 24 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CARLOS JAVIER MALDONADO-
CUEVAS,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 21-869

Agency No.
A201-153-561

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 15, 2025**

Before: FRIEDLAND, MILLER, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Carlos Javier Maldonado-Cuevas, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for cancellation of removal.

* 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).

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence whether the agency erred in applying the exceptional and extremely unusual hardship standard to a given set of facts. *Gonzalez-Juarez v. Bondi*, 137 F.4th 996, 1003 (9th Cir. 2025). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Maldonado-Cuevas has not shown exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to qualifying relatives. *See Gonzalez-Juarez*, 137 F.4th at 1006 (petitioner must show hardship “substantially beyond the ordinary hardship that would be expected when a close family member leaves the country” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

We do not consider the new allegations of hardship Maldonado-Cuevas references in his supplemental letter brief (Docket Entry No. 39) that are not part of the administrative record. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 963-64 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

The government’s motion (Docket Entry No. 40) to accept the untimely supplemental letter brief is granted. The clerk will file the supplemental letter brief at Docket Entry No. 42.

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.