

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 31 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

TIRSO MENDEZ-MALDONADO,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 25-7542

Agency No.
A095-130-642

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 29, 2026**

Before: McKEOWN, TALLMAN, and MENDOZA, JR., Circuit Judges.

Tirso Mendez-Maldonado, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for adjustment of status. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de

* 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).

novo questions of law. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not err in concluding that Mendez-Maldonado is ineligible for adjustment of status under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(II) based on his testimony before the IJ. *See Esquivel-Garcia v. Holder*, 593 F.3d 1025, 1030 (9th Cir. 2010) (admissions made to the IJ may be considered in determining petitioner's admissibility); *Urzua Covarrubias v. Gonzales*, 487 F.3d 742, 749 (9th Cir. 2007) (procedural safeguards set forth in *Matter of J-*, 2 I.&N. Dec. 285 (BIA 1945) inapplicable where petitioner was questioned under oath in the presence of counsel).

Because Mendez-Maldonado's admissions before the IJ were sufficient to establish inadmissibility, we need not reach his contentions regarding his interview before United States Citizenship and Immigration Services. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.