

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 21 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

EMMANUEL MARTINEZ-JUAREZ,

No. 23-1267

Petitioner,

Agency No.
A202-069-431

v.

MEMORANDUM*

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted November 19, 2025**
Phoenix, Arizona

Before: HAWKINS, HURWITZ, and COLLINS, Circuit Judges.

Emmanuel Martinez-Juarez seeks review of a decision by the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) dismissing his appeal of the decision of an immigration judge (“IJ”) denying his application for cancellation of removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. *Wilkinson v.*

* 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).

Garland, 601 U.S. 209, 217 (2024). We review for substantial evidence whether the agency erred in applying the exceptional and extremely unusual hardship standard to a set of facts. *Gonzalez-Juarez v. Bondi*, 137 F.4th 996, 1003 (9th Cir. 2025).

The agency considered the totality of the circumstances, including the age of Martinez-Juarez’s children, the financial impact his removal would have on his family, and how his removal might affect his oldest child’s religious practice. Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that the resulting hardship was not “substantially different from, or beyond, that which would normally be expected.” *Id.* at 1006 (explaining that the hardship “must deviate, in the extreme, from the norm”).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.