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Nabor Arturo Jimenez-Monjaras, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his request for administrative closure and dismissing his appeal from an immigration

[^0]judge's decision denying his application for cancellation of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252 . We deny the petition for review.

In his opening brief, Jimenez-Monjaras does not raise, and therefore waives, any challenge to the dispositive discretionary determination that he did not show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a qualifying relative for purposes of cancellation of removal. See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013) (issues not specifically raised and argued in a party's opening brief are waived).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying administrative closure. See Gonzalez-Caraveo v. Sessions, 882 F.3d 885, 891-93 (9th Cir. 2018) (holding the non-exhaustive list of factors in Matter of Avetisyan, 25 I. \& N. Dec. 688 (BIA 2012), provides a standard for reviewing administrative closure decisions).

In light of this disposition, we need not reach Jimenez-Monjaras's remaining contentions regarding administrative closure. See Simeonov v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.


[^0]:    * 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).

