

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 27 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

SALOME MOLINA-VAZQUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-4455

Agency No.
A208-721-629

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 25, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, N.R. SMITH, and DE ALBA, Circuit Judges.

Salome Molina-Vazquez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for cancellation of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence whether the agency erred in applying the exceptional and

* 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).

extremely unusual hardship standard to a given set of facts. *Gonzalez-Juarez v. Bondi*, 137 F.4th 996, 1003 (9th Cir. 2025). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Molina-Vazquez has not shown that his removal would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to his qualifying relatives. *See id.* at 1006 (petitioner must show hardship that “deviate[s], in the extreme, from the norm” when compared to “the hardship that results in the usual, ordinary course when an alien is removed”).

We reject as unsupported by the record Molina-Vasquez’s contention that the agency erred in the hardship analysis.

To the extent that Molina-Vasquez contests the agency’s determination that his family would accompany him to Mexico, we lack jurisdiction to review that factual finding. *See Lemus-Escobar v. Bondi*, 158 F.4th 944, 954 (9th Cir. 2025).

We do not address Molina-Vasquez’s contentions regarding the discretionary denial of cancellation of removal because the agency did not deny relief on this ground. *See Santiago-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 657 F.3d 820, 829 (9th Cir. 2011) (“In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.