

DEC 26 2008

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

URIBIO DANILO VASQUEZ  
ORDONEZ; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-72860

Agency Nos. A095-306-048  
A095-306-049

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted December 17, 2008\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and TROTT, Circuit Judges.

Uribio Danilo Vasquez Ordonez and Enma Rosita Vasquez, husband and  
wife and natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of

---

\* 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).

Immigration Appeals decision summarily affirming the immigration judge's denial of petitioners' application for cancellation of removal based on their failure to establish exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to their United States citizen children.

Petitioners contend that they have established the requisite hardship to their United States citizen children, and the BIA violated their due process rights when it issued a streamlined decision.

We lack jurisdiction to review petitioners' contention that they established extreme hardship to their United States citizen children, because it is a nonreviewable discretionary determination. *See Martinez-Roasa v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005). Petitioners' contention that the BIA violated their due process rights by streamlining their case is foreclosed by *Falcon-Carriche v. Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 848 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED IN PART; DENIED IN PART.**