

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 18 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

GERVACIA NICOLAS ANDRES; et al.,

No. 18-72574

Petitioners,

Agency Nos. A208-598-598

v.

A208-598-599

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

A208-598-600

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted December 11, 2019**

Before: WALLACE, CANBY, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Gervacia Nicolas Andres, and her two minor children, natives and citizens of Guatemala, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention

* 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).

Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that petitioners failed to establish that the harm they suffered or fear in Guatemala was or would be on account of a protected ground. *See Ayala v. Holder*, 640 F.3d 1095, 1097 (9th Cir. 2011) (even if membership in a particular social group is established, an applicant must still show that “persecution was or will be *on account of* his membership in such group”); *see also 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, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because petitioners failed to show it is more likely than not that they would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Guatemala. *See Garcia-Milian*, 755 F.3d at 1033-35 (concluding that petitioner did not establish the necessary state action for CAT relief).

In light of this disposition, we need not reach petitioners' remaining contentions. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.