FILED

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SEP 30 2010

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARICRUZ HERNANDEZ-RAMIRES,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-71347

Agency No. A096-345-284

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 13, 2010**

Before: SILVERMAN, CALLAHAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Maricruz Hernandez-Ramires, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying her application for cancellation of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

review de novo claims of due process violations in immigration proceedings. *Ram* v. *INS*, 243 F.3d 510, 516 (9th Cir. 2001). We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to consider Hernandez-Ramires' contention that the IJ demonstrated bias because Hernandez-Ramires failed to raise it before the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft,* 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (generally requiring exhaustion of claims before the BIA).

We lack jurisdiction to review the agency's discretionary determination that Hernandez-Ramires failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship.

See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005).

Hernandez-Ramires' contention that the BIA's order was inadequate fails because the order contained "a statement of its reasons for denying [Hernandez-Ramires] relief adequate for us to conduct our review." *See Ghaly v. INS*, 58 F.3d 1425, 1430 (9th Cir. 1995).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.

2 08-71347