

FEB 15 2008

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

LEOPOLDO RAMIREZ HERRERA; et  
al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-74134

Agency Nos. A96-061-117  
A96-061-118  
A96-061-119  
A96-061-120

MEMORANDUM \*

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

Submitted February 11, 2008 \*\*

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY and RYMER, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA")

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

07-74134

order adopting and affirming an Immigration Judge's order denying petitioners' application for cancellation of removal.

A review of the administrative record demonstrates that petitioners, Jose Alfredo Ramirez Gutierrez (A 96-061-119) and Maria Magdalena Ramirez Gutierrez (A 96-061-120), have presented no evidence that they have a qualifying relative as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1)(D). *See Molina-Estrada v. INS*, 293 F.3d 1089, 1093-94 (9th Cir. 2002). The BIA therefore correctly concluded that, as a matter of law, petitioners Jose Alfredo Ramirez Gutierrez and Maria Magdalena Ramirez Gutierrez were ineligible for cancellation of removal. Accordingly, the petition for review is summarily denied in part because the questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam).

With respect to the adult petitioners, Leopoldo Ramirez Herrera (A 96-061-117) and Catalina Ramirez Gutierrez (A 96-061-118), we have reviewed the response to the court's November 1, 2007 order to show cause, and we conclude that petitioners have failed to raise a colorable constitutional or legal claim to invoke our jurisdiction over this petition for review. *See Martinez-Rosas v.*

07-74134

*Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926 (9th Cir. 2005); *Torres-Aguilar v. INS*, 246 F.3d 1267, 1271 (9th Cir. 2001). Accordingly, the court dismisses this petition for review in part for lack of jurisdiction. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i); *Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 892 (9th Cir. 2003); *Montero-Martinez v. Ashcroft*, 277 F.3d 1137, 1144 (9th Cir. 2002).

All other pending motions are denied as moot. The temporary stay of removal and voluntary departure confirmed by Ninth Circuit General Order 6.4(c) and *Desta v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2004), shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.**