

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 29 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOSE GALDAMEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 25-2254

Agency No.  
A216-440-172

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 30, 2026\*\*

Before: RAWLINSON, VANDYKE, and MENDOZA, CIRCUIT JUDGES.

Petitioner Jose Galdamez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, seeks review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) dismissal of his appeal from an Immigration Judge’s (“IJ”) order denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention against Torture (“CAT”). We have

---

\* 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).

jurisdiction to review final orders of removal issued by the BIA under 8 U.S.C. § 1252 and deny the petition.

1. Galdamez’s argument that the BIA denied him due process or acted “arbitrar[ily] and capricious[ly]” by “affirm[ing] the [IJ’s] decision without opinion” is without merit. The BIA’s use of the streamlining procedure complied with the applicable regulation. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(e)(4). And it is not “a due process violation for the BIA to affirm the IJ’s decision without issuing an opinion.” *Falcon Carriche v. Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 851 (9th Cir. 2003).

2. Galdamez has forfeited any other challenge to the agency’s denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and CAT protection by failing to raise any arguments on those issues in his opening brief. “[A]rguments ... omitted from the opening brief are usually deemed forfeited.” *Lui v. DeJoy*, 129 F.4th 770, 780 (9th Cir. 2025) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). Even construed liberally, Galdamez’s opening brief includes no arguments containing “contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies.” Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *see also Nev. Dep’t of Corr. v. Greene*, 648 F.3d 1014, 1017, 1020 (9th Cir. 2011) (issues not supported by argument in pro se appellant’s opening brief are deemed waived).

**PETITION DENIED.<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Galdamez’s opposed motion to stay removal pending appeal (Dkt. No. 2) is denied.