

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 14 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

EFRAIN RODRIGUEZ-NAVA,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 15-73524

Agency No. A092-261-705

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 9, 2017**

Before: SCHROEDER, TASHIMA, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Efrain Rodriguez-Nava, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

questions of law, *Cerezo v. Mukasey*, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA’s determination of the governing statutes and regulations, *Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 535 (9th Cir. 2004). We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not err in finding Rodriguez-Nava failed to establish a cognizable social group. *See Ramirez-Munoz v. Lynch*, 816 F.3d 1226, 1228-29 (9th Cir. 2016); *see also Reyes v. Lynch*, 842 F.3d 1125, 1133-37 (9th Cir. 2016) (according deference to the BIA’s articulation of its “particularity” and “social distinction” requirements). Thus, Rodriguez-Nava’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. In light of this conclusion, we do not reach Rodriguez-Nava’s remaining contentions raised in his opening brief.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.