

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUN 18 2018

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

ABRAHAM SALGADO-SALGADO,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-73730

Agency No. A200-381-221

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 12, 2018**

Before: RAWLINSON, CLIFTON, and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

Abraham Salgado-Salgado, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying cancellation of removal. We dismiss the petition for review.

* 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).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Salgado-Salgado's unexhausted sole contention. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1); *Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004). Salgado-Salgado contends that the IJ's failure to allow him to submit updated hardship evidence prior to issuing the removal order constituted a due process violation and a violation of 8 U.S.C § 1229a(b)(4)(B); however, Salgado-Salgado failed to adequately raise this contention in his brief to the BIA. *See Young v. Holder*, 697 F.3d 976, 982 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc), *abrogated in part on other grounds by Moncrieffe v. Holder*, 133 S.Ct. 1678 (2013) ("Presenting an argument to the BIA requires reasoning sufficient to put the BIA on notice that it was called on to decide the issue. A general challenge to the IJ's decision is insufficient; the alien must specify particular issues on appeal to the BIA.") (citation omitted)).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.