

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 21 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DONALD GALLEGOS-AREVALO,

No. 21-70596

Petitioner,

Agency No. A205-788-808

v.

MEMORANDUM*

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted November 17, 2022**
San Jose, California

Before: SCHROEDER, GRABER, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Donald Gallegos-Arevalo, 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 his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, cancellation of removal, and protection under the

* 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).

Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252, and we deny the petition for review.

Gallegos-Arevalo contends that the IJ lacked jurisdiction because the notice to appear the government served on him omitted the date and time of his hearing. That argument is foreclosed by *United States v. Bastide-Hernandez*, 39 F.4th 1187, 1188, 1193 (9th Cir. 2022) (en banc) (holding that a lack of hearing information in a notice to appear does not deprive an immigration court of subject matter jurisdiction and that the requirements of 8 C.F.R. § 1003.14(a) are satisfied when a later notice provides the hearing information).

Gallegos-Arevalo also contends that, by omitting the date and time of his hearing, his notice to appear violated a mandatory claim-processing rule and that this error requires termination of his removal proceedings. That argument fails because Gallegos-Arevalo has not shown that the omission of that information in the notice to appear prejudiced him. *See Zamorano v. Garland*, 2 F.4th 1213, 1228 (9th Cir. 2021) (holding that harmless error principles apply to our review of immigration agency decisions). He received actual notice through a later supplemental document and appeared at every one of his scheduled hearings.

To the extent that Gallegos-Arevalo contends that the proceedings before the IJ violated his due process rights—or that the BIA erred in affirming the IJ’s denial of Gallegos-Arevalo’s asylum, withholding of removal, cancellation of removal,

and CAT claims—those arguments are deemed abandoned because he does not develop them with any specificity or support them with any record citations. *See Rios v. Lynch*, 807 F.3d 1123, 1125, n.1 (9th Cir. 2015) (holding that a claim that is not addressed with any specificity in a brief is deemed abandoned).

AFFIRMED.