**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

OCT 28 2026

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

| | |
|---|---|
| SANDRA MADRIGAL RAMIREZ,<br><br>Petitioner,<br><br>v.<br><br>TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,<br><br>Respondent. | No. 25-5231<br><br>Agency No.<br>A092-277-072<br><br>MEMORANDUM[*] |

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

Submitted October 23, 2026[**]
Pasadena, California

Before: MURGUIA, Chief Judge, and GOULD and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Petitioner Sandra Madrigal Ramirez ("Madrigal Ramirez"), a native and citizen of Mexico, seeks review of a Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") decision denying her request for administrative closure. Madrigal Ramirez also asserts a due process claim premised upon a deficient Notice to Appear ("NTA"). We lack

[*] 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 her petition under 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(C) and dismiss.

During removal proceedings, Madrigal Ramirez applied for relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). On February 20, 2020, the Immigration Judge ("IJ") denied Madrigal Ramirez's application for CAT relief. Madrigal Ramirez appealed that decision to the BIA and requested administrative closure of her case based upon her pending U Nonimmigrant Status application. On July 17, 2025, the BIA affirmed the IJ's denial of relief under the CAT and denied Madrigal Ramirez's request for administrative closure.

Madrigal Ramirez filed a petition for review, asking that we reverse the BIA's decision denying administrative closure and that we remand the case to the BIA so that the Petitioner may "exercise her due process right to a full and fair hearing regarding her Notice to Appear."[1]

1. We lack jurisdiction to review factual challenges to "any final order of removal against" a noncitizen where the noncitizen "is removable by reason of having committed a criminal offense covered in section . . . 1227(a)(2)(A)(iii), (B), (C), or (D) of this title." *See* 8 U.S.C § 1252(a)(2)(C). Madrigal Ramirez conceded removability pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(2)(B)(i). Accordingly, the

[1] Madrigal Ramirez's original petition sought review of the BIA's denial of her claim for CAT protection (Dkt. No. 1). But Madrigal Ramirez omits any challenge to the denial of CAT relief in her appellate brief. She has waived this argument. *See, e.g.*, *Nguyen v. Barr*, 983 F.3d 1099, 1102 (9th Cir. 2020); *Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079–80 (9th Cir. 2013).

jurisdictional bar applies, and we can only review a challenge to her order of removal insofar as Madrigal Ramirez raises a constitutional claim or question of law. *See* 8 U.S.C § 1252(a)(2)(D). Madrigal Ramirez does not present either. *See Coria v. Garland*, 114 F.4th 994, 1010–11 (9th Cir. 2024). Accordingly, we lack jurisdiction to review the petition under 8 U.S.C § 1252(a)(2)(C).

2. Madrigal Ramirez also asserts that the NTA that she received is deficient because it failed to include the date and time of her removal hearing. However, Madrigal Ramirez raised this issue for the first time on appeal. Accordingly, Madrigal Ramirez failed to exhaust her administrative remedies, and this claim is dismissed. *See, e.g.*, *Bare v. Barr*, 975 F.3d 952, 960 (9th Cir. 2020) (citing *Zhang v. Ashcroft*, 388 F.3d 713, 721 (9th Cir. 2004)).

**DISMISSED**.[2]

[2] The stay of removal (Dkt. No. 3) will dissolve upon the issuance of the mandate.