NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

OCT 27 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RAMIRO NUNEZ-REYES, Petitioner, v. TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 21-252 Agency No. A205-150-621 MEMORANDUM[*]

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

Submitted October 27, 2026[**]
San Francisco, California

Before: BENNETT and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges, and CARTWRIGHT, District Judge.[***]

Ramiro Nunez-Reyes, a native and citizen of Mexico, seeks review of a Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") order affirming an immigration judge's denial of

[*] 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 Honorable Tiffany M. Cartwright, United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington, sitting by designation.

cancellation of removal on the ground that Nunez-Reyes failed to show that his "removal would result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" to his United States citizen daughter. 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1)(D). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D), *see Wilkinson v. Garland*, 601 U.S. 209, 217 (2024), and deny the petition.

We review the BIA's hardship determination under the "highly deferential" substantial evidence standard. *Gonzalez-Juarez v. Bondi*, 137 F.4th 996, 1002–03 (9th Cir. 2025). Under this standard, the BIA's hardship determination is "conclusive unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to conclude to the contrary." *Id.* at 1002 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B)).

The record does not compel the conclusion that Nunez-Reyes's daughter would suffer "out of the ordinary and exceedingly uncommon" hardship if Nunez-Reyes were removed. *See id.* at 1006. As stated in the BIA's order, Nunez-Reyes's daughter would remain in the United States with her mother, who would provide her with emotional, physical, and financial support, and his daughter "does not have any compelling medical or special needs that that w[ould] not be met if [he were] removed." Further, Nunez-Reyes would likely be able to find employment in Mexico, allowing him to continue to support his daughter financially. Given these facts—which we may not review, *see Wilkinson*, 601 U.S. at 225—the BIA reasonably concluded that the hardship to Nunez-Reyes's daughter, including any

mental health issues that she might suffer from his removal, would not "deviate, in the extreme, from the norm." *See Gonzalez-Juarez*, 137 F.4th at 1006. Nunez-Reyes's contention that the BIA applied the wrong standard by failing to consider the future hardship his daughter would experience if he were removed is belied by the record.

PETITION DENIED.[1]

[1] The stay of removal is lifted.