

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 29 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RAUL RICARDO JACOBO,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 15-70864

Agency No. A201-237-293

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted October 26, 2020\*\*

Before: McKEOWN, RAWLINSON, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Raul Ricardo Jacobo, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for withholding of removal.

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

the agency's factual findings. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Jacobo failed to establish he suffered harm that rises to the level of persecution. *See Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1019-21 (9th Cir. 2006) (detention, beating, and interrogation did not compel a finding of past persecution); *Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1182 (9th Cir. 2003) (harassment, threats, and one beating unconnected with any particular threat did not compel a finding that past harm rose to the level of persecution).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's determination that Jacobo failed to establish a clear probability of future persecution by the police in El Salvador. *See Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1018 (9th Cir. 2003) (possibility of future persecution "too speculative"). Further, substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Jacobo failed to establish he would be persecuted by gangs on account of a family-based social group or a political opinion. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992) (an applicant "must provide *some* evidence of [motive], direct or circumstantial"); *Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 856 (9th Cir. 2009) (rejecting political opinion claim where petitioner did not present sufficient evidence of political or ideological opposition to the gang's ideals or that the gang imputed a particular political belief to the petitioner); *see*

*also Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (an applicant’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”).

In his opening brief, Jacobo does not challenge the agency’s determinations as to his remaining social groups. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013) (issues not specifically raised and argued in a party’s opening brief are waived).

Thus, Jacobo’s withholding of removal claim fails.

As stated in the court’s April 10, 2015 order, the temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**