

MAY 22 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MEIEN LI,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 09-72989

Agency No. A096-057-365

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 15, 2012**

Before: CANBY, GRABER and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Meien Li, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying her 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, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006), and we deny the petition for review.

Li does not challenge the agency's dispositive determination that her asylum application was time-barred. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not supported by argument are deemed waived).

Accordingly, her asylum claim fails.

Li is unmarried and has no children. She fears she will be harmed in China if, at some point, she violates China's family planning practices. Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of withholding of removal because Li's fear of future harm is speculative. *See Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1018 (9th Cir. 2003) (possibility of future persecution too speculative).

Finally, substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of Li's CAT claim because she failed to establish it is more likely than not she will be tortured if returned to India. *See Zheng v. Holder*, 644 F.3d 829, 835 (9th Cir. 2011).

PETITION FOR REVIEW IS DENIED.