

DEC 11 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>LEODEGARI CONTRERAS-REYES,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 12-70088

Agency No. A099-475-210

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 19, 2013**

Before: CANBY, TROTT, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Leodegari Contreras-Reyes, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s denial of his application for cancellation of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 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 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).

the agency's continuous physical presence determination. *Ibarra-Flores v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 614, 618 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Contreras-Reyes did not demonstrate ten years of continuous physical presence in the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(d)(2) (departure for any periods exceeding 180 days in the aggregate breaks continuous physical presence).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Contreras-Reyes' due process claim regarding the lack of an interpreter at his removal hearing because he did not raise it before the agency and therefore failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (this court lacks jurisdiction to review contentions not raised before the agency).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.