UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JOSE FRANCISCO ZAVALA and JOSEFINA RIVAS,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 10-70191

Agency Nos. A094-810-414 A094-810-415

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.

Jose Francisco Zavala and Josefina Rivas, husband and wife and natives and

citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals

order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's (IJ) decision denying

their application for asylum, withholding of removal and protection under the

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

FILED

FEB 29 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

^{**} The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Convention Against Torture (CAT). Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the Board's timeliness determination as to petitioners' asylum application, filed 19 months late. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3); *Ramadan v. Gonzales*, 479 F.3d 646, 650 (9th Cir. 2007). We lack jurisdiction to consider petitioners' unexhausted contention that their untimely asylum application is excused by extraordinary or changed circumstances. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004).

Substantial evidence supports the Board's denial of withholding of removal because petitioners failed to show their alleged persecutors threatened them on account of a protected ground. Petitioners' fear of future persecution based on an actual or imputed anti-gang or anti-crime opinion is not on account of the protected ground of either membership in a particular social group or political opinion. *Ramos Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 854-56 (9th Cir. 2009); *Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 745-46 (9th Cir. 2008); *see Ochave v. INS*, 254 F.3d 859, 865 (9th Cir. 2001) ("Asylum generally is not available to victims of civil strife, unless they are singled out on account of a protected ground.")

Substantial evidence also supports the Board's denial of CAT relief based on the Board's finding that petitioners did not establish a likelihood of torture by, at the instigation of, or with the consent or acquiescence of the El Salvadoran government. *See Arteaga v. Mukasey*, 511 F.3d 940, 948-49 (9th Cir. 2007).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.