

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 26 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DOMINGA TORRES ARREOLA; et al.,

No. 19-71336

Petitioners,

Agency Nos. A206-914-129

v.

A206-914-130

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

A206-914-131

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 18, 2019**

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

Dominga Torres Arreola and her two minor children, natives and citizens of Mexico, 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 Against Torture

* 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).

(“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), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s finding that petitioners’ past harm did not rise to the level of persecution. *See Duran-Rodriguez v. Barr*, 918 F.3d 1025, 1028 (9th Cir. 2019) (“threats alone, particularly anonymous or vague ones, rarely constitute persecution”). In their opening brief, petitioners do not challenge the agency’s determination that petitioners failed to show that they could not safely relocate to another part of Mexico or that it would be unreasonable to expect them to do so. *See Corro-Barragan v. Holder*, 718 F.3d 1174, 1177 n.5 (9th Cir. 2013) (failure to contest issue in opening brief resulted in waiver). Thus, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach petitioners’ remaining contentions regarding asylum and withholding of removal. *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).

In their opening brief, petitioners do not challenge the agency’s denial of

CAT relief. *See Corro-Barragan*, 718 F.3d at 1177 n.5.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.