# United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit
**FILED**
March 30, 2022
Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 20-61060

ZULMA YANETH GONZALEZ DE SANCHEZ; ABRAHAM ISAAC SANCHEZ-GONZALEZ; RUBY ELIZABETH SANCHEZ-GONZALEZ,

*Petitioners*,

*versus*

MERRICK GARLAND, *U.S. Attorney General*,

*Respondent*.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A208 747 558
Agency No. A208 747 556
Agency No. A208 747 557

Before JOLLY, WILLETT, and ENGELHARDT, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

Petitioners, Zulma Yaneth Gonzalez De Sanchez and her two minor children, are natives and citizens of El Salvador who were charged with removability under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i). An immigration judge

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

subsequently denied their application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. The Board of Immigration Appeals affirmed. On appeal, Petitioners challenge the BIA's affirmance, arguing that (1) they established past persecution and a well-founded fear of future persecution based on membership in cognizable social groups, and (2) the denial of asylum violated their due process rights.

Petitioners' arguments fail. For one, Petitioners have not shown the evidence "'was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find' the nexus requirement satisfied." *Berrios-Bruno v. Garland*, No. 18-60276, 2021 WL 3624766, at *4 (5th Cir. Aug. 16, 2021) (per curiam) (citing *INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 483–84 (1992)); *accord Orellana-Monson v. Holder*, 685 F.3d 511, 518 (5th Cir. 2012). Substantial evidence supports the BIA's conclusion that Salvadorian gang members were not sufficiently motivated by Petitioners' family ties when issuing various threats.[1] *See, e.g.*, *Vazquez-Guerra v. Garland*, 7 F.4th 265, 270 (5th Cir. 2021); *Velasquez-De Hernandez v. Garland*, No. 20-60104, 2022 WL 126992, at *1 (5th Cir. Jan. 12, 2022) (per curiam). Accordingly, we will not "re-weigh evidence or . . . substitute our own factual determinations." *Berrios-Bruno*, 2021 WL 3624766, at *4 (citing *Chen v. Gonzales*, 470 F.3d 1131, 1134 (5th Cir. 2006)).

Furthermore, Petitioners' one-paragraph due process argument is vague at best. We thus consider it abandoned. *See Chambers v. Mukasey*, 520 F.3d 445, 448 n.1 (5th Cir. 2008) (declining cursory due process claim).

The Petition is DENIED.

---

[1] This moots any hypothetical need to consider whether Petitioners' family-based social group was, in fact, cognizable. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (per curiam). Neither must we analyze Petitioners' eligibility for withholding of removal, which imposes a higher bar than that for asylum. *See, e.g.*, *Majd v. Gonzales*, 446 F.3d 590, 595 (5th Cir. 2006) (citation omitted).