

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 25 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOSE ISMAEL QUINTANILLA
RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 20-70676

Agency No. A215-820-513

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 17, 2021**

Before: SILVERMAN, CHRISTEN, and LEE, Circuit Judges.

Jose Ismael Quintanilla Rodriguez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention

* 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).

Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law. *Bhattarai v. Lynch*, 835 F.3d 1037, 1042 (9th Cir. 2016). We grant the petition for review and we remand.

In his appeal brief to the BIA, Quintanilla Rodriguez raised a request to remand his proceedings to submit further evidence of his claims. In his opening brief, Quintanilla Rodriguez contends the BIA erred by failing to address that argument. We agree. *See Sagaydak v. Gonzales*, 405 F.3d 1035, 1040 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[T]he BIA [is] not free to ignore arguments raised by a petitioner.”); *see also Andia v. Ashcroft*, 359 F.3d 1181, 1184 (9th Cir. 2004) (“In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency. If we conclude that the BIA’s decision cannot be sustained upon its reasoning, we must remand to allow the agency to decide any issues remaining in the case.”). Thus, we grant the petition for review and remand to the agency for further proceedings consistent with this disposition. *See INS v. Ventura*, 537 U.S. 12, 16-18 (2002) (per curiam).

In light of this disposition, we do not reach the merits of Quintanilla Rodriguez’s asylum, withholding of removal, and CAT claims.

The parties shall bear their own costs on appeal.

Quintanilla Rodriguez’s removal is stayed pending a decision by the BIA.

PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED; REMANDED.