

MAR 06 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MIRNA RODRIGUEZ-ROJA, a.k.a.  
Maria Dolores Rodriguez, a.k.a. Mirna  
Rodriguez Rojas,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-71637

Agency No. A098-435-842

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 21, 2012\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, McKEOWN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Mirna Rodriguez-Roja, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her application for asylum, withholding

---

\* 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).

of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law, *Cerezo v. Mukasey*, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA’s determination of the governing statutes and regulations, *Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 535 (9th Cir. 2004). We review for substantial evidence factual findings. *Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 854 (9th Cir. 2009). We deny the petition for review.

Rodriguez-Roja testified gang members attacked her and demanded money because they knew she had relatives in the United States. Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Rodriguez-Roja failed to demonstrate that she is eligible for asylum and withholding of removal based on her membership in a particular social group. *See Delgado-Ortiz v. Holder*, 600 F.3d 1148, 1151-52 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also Barrios*, 581 F.3d at 856 (evidence supported conclusion that gang victimized the petitioner for economic and personal reasons rather than on account of a protected ground). Accordingly, Rodriguez-Roja’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of Rodriguez-Roja’s CAT claim because she failed to establish a likelihood of torture by or with the

consent or acquiescence of a government official if returned to El Salvador. *See Arteaga v. Mukasey*, 511 F.3d 940, 948-49 (9th Cir. 2007).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**