

AUG 18 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GLENDY MAGALI VASQUEZ-  
MANZANARES,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 11-73760

Agency No. A099-535-343

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted August 13, 2014\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, THOMAS, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Glendy Magali Vasquez-Manzanares, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying her motion to reopen removal proceedings. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the BIA’s denial of a motion to

---

\* 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).

reopen. *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Vasquez-Manzanares's motion to reopen because it considered the record and acted within its broad discretion in determining that the evidence was insufficient to establish prima facie eligibility for asylum, withholding of removal, or relief under the Convention Against Torture. *See Shin v. Mukasey*, 547 F.3d 1019, 1025 (9th Cir. 2008) (petitioner bears the burden of proving the evidence would likely change the result in the case).

We reject Vasquez-Manzanares's contention that the BIA ignored evidence because she has not overcome the presumption that the BIA reviewed the record. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 603 (9th Cir. 2006).

Vasquez-Manzanares's contention that she was targeted as a female student for sexual assault and aggression is unexhausted. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004). We reject her contention that the BIA misidentified her proposed social group. We lack jurisdiction to reach Vasquez-Manzanares's challenges to the BIA's denial of her direct appeal because the petition for review is not timely as to that decision. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(1); *Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1258 (9th Cir. 1996).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.**