UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ASHOT GHAZARYAN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-72703

Agency No. A095-297-253

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 13, 2010\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, CALLAHAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Ashot Ghazaryan, a native of Armenia and citizen of Argentina, petitions

pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order summarily affirming

an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for asylum,

withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").

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

## FILED

SEP 28 2010

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

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Ornelas-Chavez v. Gonzales*, 458 F.3d 1052, 1055-56 (9th Cir. 2006), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's finding that Ghazaryan did not establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution, because he failed to demonstrate the government was unwilling or unable to control the men who beat and threatened him. *See Nahrvani v. Gonzales*, 399 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2005). Accordingly, Ghazaryan's asylum claim fails.

Because Ghazaryan did not establish eligibility for asylum, it follows that he did not satisfy the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's denial of Ghazaryan's CAT claim because he failed to demonstrate it is more likely than not he will be tortured if returned to Argentina. *See Arteaga v. Mukasey*, 511 F.3d 940, 948-49 (9th Cir. 2007).

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.