

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 14 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

KARINA BETZAIDA MENDOZA-DERAS,

No. 17-70793

Petitioner,

Agency No. A208-163-023

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted December 8, 2022\*\*

Before: WALLACE, TALLMAN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Karina Betzaida Mendoza-Deras, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against

---

\* 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).

Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review factual findings for substantial evidence. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241 (9th Cir. 2020). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the determination that Mendoza-Deras failed to establish she was or would be persecuted on account of a protected ground. *See Madrigal v. Holder*, 716 F.3d 499, 506 (9th Cir. 2013) (“mistreatment motivated purely by personal retribution will not give rise to a valid asylum claim”); *Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (an applicant’s “desire to be free from harassment by criminals motivated by theft or random violence by gang members bears no nexus to a protected ground”). Thus, Mendoza-Deras’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the denial of CAT protection because Mendoza-Deras failed to show it is more likely than not she will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to El Salvador. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009). We reject as unsupported by the record Mendoza-Deras’s contentions that the BIA applied an incorrect legal standard or otherwise erred in the analysis of her CAT claim.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**