

OCT 20 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MANUEL SALVADOR CISNEROS-  
PONCE, a.k.a. Manuel Salvador Cisneros,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 11-71927

Agency No. A200-877-402

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted October 14, 2014\*\*

Before: LEAVY, GOULD, and BERZON, Circuit Judges.

Manuel Salvador Cisneros-Ponce, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have

---

\* 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).

jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence factual findings, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006), and we deny the petition for review.

Cisneros-Ponce does not claim to have suffered past persecution. Substantial evidence supports the agency's finding that Cisneros-Ponce did not establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1018 (9th Cir. 2003) (possibility of persecution was "too speculative"). Thus, Cisneros-Ponce's asylum claim fails.

Because Cisneros-Ponce failed to meet the lower burden of proof for asylum, it follows that he has not met the higher standard for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye*, 453 F.3d at 1190.

Finally, substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Cisneros-Ponce failed to establish that it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the acquiescence of the government of Mexico. *See Silaya v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1066, 1073 (9th Cir. 2008).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**