

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-60615
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 28, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

JUAN DE DIOS OLIVERA-ROMO,

Petitioner,

versus

TODD WALLACE BLANCHE, *U.S. Attorney General,*

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A206 241 626

Before WIENER, WILLETT, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff-Appellant Juan De Dios Olivera-Romo, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) upholding the denial of his application for cancellation of removal by the immigration judge (IJ). He claims that his removal would cause exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to his United States

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-60615

citizen wife and that the BIA erred in not cumulatively considering the hardship evidence.

We review the BIA's decisions of law *de novo*. *Sustaita-Cordova v. Garland*, 120 F.4th 511, 517 (5th Cir. 2024). We consider the IJ's decision only to the extent it influenced the BIA. *Id.* Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(i), we lack jurisdiction to review the factual findings underlying the agency's conclusion on the issue of hardship. *Wilkinson v. Garland*, 601 U.S. 209, 225 (2024). However, whether an established set of facts satisfies the legal standard of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship is a mixed question of fact and law that is reviewable. *Id.* at 216-17, 225.

To the extent that Olivera-Romo disputes the correctness of the agency's factual findings underlying its conclusion on hardship, those findings are unreviewable. *See id.*; *Sustaita-Cordova*, 120 F.4th at 518. He has not otherwise shown the BIA erred in concluding that the difficulties his wife might experience did not rise to the level of exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. *See Cuenca-Arroyo v. Garland*, 123 F.4th 781, 785 (5th Cir. 2024). Further, his contention that the BIA failed to cumulatively consider all the hardship evidence is belied by the record. *See L.N. v. Garland*, 109 F.4th 389, 396 (5th Cir. 2024).

The petition for review is DENIED.