

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 15 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

VLADIMIR VLADIMIROVICH
MANZENKO,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 17-71516

Agency No. A071-139-180

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of Orders of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted June 12, 2018**

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

Vladimir Vladimirovich Manzenko, a native of the U.S.S.R. and citizen of Ukraine, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") orders dismissing his appeals from an immigration judge's ("IJ") removal order denying

* 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).

cancellation of removal and an IJ's order denying his motions to reopen and remand. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo claims of due process violations. *Padilla-Martinez v. Holder*, 770 F.3d 825, 830 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

Manzenko's contention that the agency violated due process by denying him the opportunity to submit new evidence is not supported, where the BIA considered the proffered evidence in its de novo review of the IJ's discretionary denial of cancellation of removal. *See id.* ("To prevail on a due-process claim, a petitioner must demonstrate both a violation of rights and prejudice."); *Singh v. Holder*, 591 F.3d 1190, 1199 (9th Cir. 2010) (any error by the IJ was rendered harmless by the BIA's de novo review of the issue).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.