## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**FILED** 

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 17 2023

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

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SABINO HERNANDEZ GARCIA,

No. 20-70142

Petitioner,

Agency No. A205-600-694

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted March 14, 2023\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, SUNG, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Sabino Hernandez Garcia, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reconsider and reopen removal proceedings. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reconsider and

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

the denial of a motion to reopen. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Hernandez Garcia's motion to reconsider where his contention that the immigration judge lacked jurisdiction over his proceedings is foreclosed by *United States v. Bastide-Hernandez*, 39 F.4th 1187, 1188, 1193 (9th Cir. 2022) (en banc) (lack of hearing information in notice to appear does not deprive immigration court of subject matter jurisdiction, and 8 C.F.R. § 1003.14(a) is satisfied when later notice provides hearing information).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Hernandez Garcia's motion to reopen where he failed to establish the requisite hardship for relief. *See Garcia v. Holder*, 621 F.3d 906, 912 (9th Cir. 2010) (a motion to reopen will not be granted absent a showing of prima facie eligibility for relief based on demonstrating "a reasonable likelihood that the statutory requirements for relief have been satisfied" (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).

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

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.

2 20-70142