IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit
FILED
April 29, 2010
Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 09-60614
Summary Calendar

CARLOS DAVID GONZALEZ-RUIZ,

Petitioner

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., U. S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A094 792 066

Before GARZA, CLEMENT, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:[*]

Carlos David Gonzalez-Ruiz (Gonzalez) petitions this court for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) vacating the Immigration Judge's (IJ) grant of his application for discretionary relief in the form of cancellation of removal under § 240A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1). Gonzalez asserts that the BIA erred in reversing the IJ's decision because the BIA failed to engage in a substantive review of the facts as the IJ had done. He also maintains, however, that the BIA

[*] Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

reviewed the facts de novo but failed to consider many positive factors that weighed in favor of granting relief.

To the extent that Gonzalez challenges the BIA's discretionary denial of relief, we lack jurisdiction to consider this contention. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B); *Delgado-Reynua v. Gonzales*, 450 F.3d 596, 599-600 (5th Cir. 2006). Gonzalez attempts to circumvent this jurisdictional limitation by arguing that his claim concerning the BIA's method of analysis presents a legal question. This argument is unavailing. *See Delgado-Reynua*, 450 F.3d at 599-600; *see also Sung v. Keisler*, 505 F.3d 372, 377 (5th Cir. 2007) (holding that the court lacked jurisdiction over a claim that the agency failed to consider all relevant factors in denying cancellation of removal). Gonzalez's petition for review is thus DISMISSED for want of jurisdiction.