

**FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

RAMON RAMIREZ-ALEJANDRE,
Petitioner,

No. 00-70724

v.

I&NS No.
A70-450-725

JOHN ASHCROFT,* Attorney General
of the United States of America.

OPINION

Peti for Reviewesan Order Tw (oferal) Tj 0 -13.8 TD 219.186 Tc219.186 Board Tw Imm

d

a

!

n

e

P

Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA),
Pub. L. No. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009, 3009-625 (1996). How-
ever, because we retain jurisdiction to determine if the BIA

compensation injury to his back on January 3, 1994 and was

denied him due process. He relies on Larita-Martinez v. INS, 220 F.3d 1092 (9th Cir. 2000), where we stated:

There is no administrative rule requiring the Board to review all relevant evidence submitted on appeal. It is beyond argument, however, that the Due Process Clause requirement of 'a full and fair hearing' mandates that the Board do so in its capacity as a reviewing tribunal. Indeed, it is so expected that a court would review all relevant materials in the

not to create, a record." Fedorenko, 19 I. & N. Dec. at 74. To
be sure the Board may, and sometimes does, entertain supple-
menta6Aidence by taking administrative (nice of commonlye-) TT*TD -0.8028 Tc 0.8028 Twknown factsin ch a

cate to the Larita-Martinez panel's conclusion that the Board fulfilled its due process obligations is the holding that a due process requirement exists.

