FILED

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SEP 04 2015

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JAIME ARTURO VALDEZ-REYES,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-74128

Agency No. A201-288-309

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 25, 2015**

Before: McKEOWN, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Jaime Arturo Valdez-Reyes, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture

^{*} 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).

("CAT"). Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Valdez-Reyes did not establish that he would be persecuted on account of a protected ground. *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (petitioner's "desire to be free from harassment by criminals motivated by theft or random violence by gang members bears no nexus to a protected ground"); *see also Parussimova v. Mukasey*, 555 F.3d 734, 740 (9th Cir. 2009) (the REAL ID Act "requires that a protected ground represent 'one central reason' for an asylum applicant's persecution"). Thus, we deny Valdez-Reyes' petition as to his asylum and withholding of removal claims.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Valdez-Reyes failed to show it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Mexico. *See Silaya v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1066, 1073 (9th Cir. 2008). Thus, we deny Valdez-Reyes' petition as to his CAT claim.

2 13-74128

Finally, we lack jurisdiction to consider Valdez-Reyes' cancellation of removal claim because he did not exhaust it before the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.

3 13-74128