

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 31 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ZULMA EVERANDA BONILLA-DIAZ;
et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-6904

Agency Nos.

A220-149-710

A220-149-711

A220-149-712

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.

Zulma Everanda Bonilla-Diaz and her children, natives and citizens of Guatemala, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying their applications for asylum, withholding of removal and protection under

* 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).

the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”), and denying their requests for administrative closure and remand. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny the petition for review.

Petitioners do not challenge the BIA’s conclusion that they waived review of the IJ’s denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the CAT, thus we do not address it. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013). Petitioners’ contentions regarding the merits of these claims are not properly before the court because petitioners did not raise them before the BIA. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (administrative remedies must be exhausted); *see also Suate-Orellana v. Garland*, 101 F.4th 624, 629 (9th Cir. 2024) (the exhaustion requirement is not jurisdictional, but must be enforced if properly raised by a party).

Petitioners also do not challenge the BIA’s decision regarding a due process claim, or the denial of their requests for administrative closure and remand. *See Lopez-Vasquez*, 706 F.3d at 1079-80.

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.