

OCT 25 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

VALENTINA ANDRANIKI
SARKSYAN; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-70468

Agency Nos. A095-640-594

A095-640-595

A095-640-596

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 19, 2010**

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, TALLMAN, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Valentina Andraniki Sarksyian, a native of Iran and citizen of Armenia, and her children, natives and citizens of Armenia, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying Sarksyian's application for asylum, withholding of removal, and

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

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

relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1015 (9th Cir. 2003), and deny the petition for review.

Sarksyan fears persecution from Armenian authorities based on her husband’s activities with the Dashnaktsutyun political party. Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that Sarksyan did not establish that she was or would be persecuted on account of an actual or imputed political opinion. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 n.1 (1992) (to reverse the agency’s finding “we must find that the evidence not only *supports* that conclusion, but *compels* it”) (emphasis in original); *Sangha v. INS*, 103 F.3d 1482, 1489-90 (9th Cir. 1997). Accordingly, Sarksyan’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Ochoa v. Gonzales*, 406 F.3d 1166, 1172 (9th Cir. 2005).

Petitioners’ opening brief does not raise any challenge to the agency’s denial of CAT relief. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996) (stating that issues not supported by argument are deemed abandoned).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.