

AUG 16 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>EKO PAKU SADEWO,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---

No. 11-72970

Agency No. A095-630-138

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted August 14, 2013\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, GRABER, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Eko Paku Sadewo, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for

---

\* 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).

substantial evidence the agency's factual findings. *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009). We deny the petition for review.

The record does not compel the conclusion that Sadewo established changed or extraordinary circumstances to excuse his untimely asylum application. *See* 8 C.F.R. §§ 1208.4(a)(4), (5). Accordingly, Sadewo's asylum claim fails.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's determination that the harm Sadewo suffered in Indonesia does not rise to the level of persecution. *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 975-76 (9th Cir. 2009). Further, substantial evidence supports the BIA's determination that, even under a disfavored group analysis, Sadewo failed to show sufficient individualized risk to establish that it is more likely than not he would be persecuted if removed to Indonesia. *See id.* at 979; *see also Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1066 (“[a]n applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence to prevail than would an asylum applicant”). We reject Sadewo's contention that the BIA applied the disfavored group analysis incorrectly. Accordingly, Sadewo's withholding of removal claim fails.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**