

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 9 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

AZUCENA LOPEZ CEDILLO,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 19-71758

Agency No. A079-786-754

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an  
Immigration Judge's Decision

Submitted June 2, 2022\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, KOH, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Azucena Lopez Cedillo, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of an immigration judge's ("IJ") determination under 8 C.F.R. § 1208.31(a) that she did not have a reasonable fear of persecution or torture in Mexico and thus is not entitled to relief from her reinstated removal order. We have jurisdiction under

---

\* 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).

8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review an IJ's negative reasonable fear determination for substantial evidence. *Andrade-Garcia v. Lynch*, 828 F.3d 829, 833 (9th Cir. 2016). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's determination that Lopez Cedillo failed to establish a reasonable possibility of persecution in Mexico on account of a protected ground. *See Molina-Morales v. INS*, 237 F.3d 1048, 1051-52 (9th Cir. 2001) (personal retribution is not persecution on account of a protected ground); *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").

Substantial evidence also supports the IJ's determination that Lopez Cedillo failed to demonstrate a reasonable possibility of torture by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Mexico. *See Andrade-Garcia*, 828 F.3d at 836-37 (no reasonable possibility of torture with state action).

We reject as unsupported by the record Lopez Cedillo's contentions that the IJ violated her due process rights, committed errors of law, or otherwise erred in the analysis of her claims.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**