

JAN 19 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

KIRAN PRAJAPATI, a.k.a. KUNAL  
PATEL,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-71041

Agency No. A095-727-110

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted January 10, 2011\*\*

Before: BEEZER, TALLMAN, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Kiran Prajapati, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 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 for substantial evidence, *Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 742 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s finding that the attacks upon Prajapati and his family were tied to money disputes and that Prajapati failed to establish that a protected ground was at least one central reason for the attacks. *See Parussimova v. Mukasey*, 555 F.3d 734, 740-41 (9th Cir. 2009) (“[t]he Real ID Act requires that a protected ground represent ‘one central reason’ for an asylum applicant’s persecution”). Accordingly, Prajapati’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 856 (9th Cir. 2009).

We do not address Prajapati’s CAT claim because he did not specifically and distinctly challenge it in his opening brief. *See Castro-Perez v. Gonzales*, 409 F.3d 1069, 1072 (9th Cir. 2005) (failure to raise a claim results in waiver).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**