NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

OCT 30 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUAN ROJAS-PEREZ, Petitioner, v. TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 23-921 Agency No. A208-055-634 MEMORANDUM[*]

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

Submitted October 27, 2026[**]

Before: SILVERMAN, FORREST, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Juan Rojas-Perez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for cancellation of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence

[*] 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).

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

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Rojas-Perez has not shown exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to qualifying relatives. *See id*. at 1006 (petitioner must show hardship "substantially beyond the ordinary hardship that would be expected when a close family member leaves the country" (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Rojas-Perez's contention that the agency violated due process by applying an incorrect analysis and failing to consider testimony and evidence is not properly before the court because he did not raise it before the agency. *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).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.