

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 18 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MARIO JEAVANNI ROJAS, AKA Mario  
Rojas, AKA Mario Jeovanny Rojas, AKA  
Mario Jevany Rojas,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 15-72359

Agency No. A078-127-789

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 12, 2018\*\*

Before: LEAVY, HAWKINS, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Mario Jeavanni Rojas, native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for withholding of

---

\* 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).

removal and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion the denial of a continuance, *Sandoval-Luna v. Mukasey*, 526 F.3d 1243, 1246 (9th Cir. 2008), and review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

Rojas fears harm from gangs in El Salvador. Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that Rojas failed to establish the government of El Salvador was or would be unwilling or unable to protect him. *See Castro-Perez v. Gonzales*, 409 F.3d 1069, 1072 (9th Cir. 2005). Thus, Rojas’s withholding of removal claim fails.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Rojas failed to show it is more likely than not that he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government of El Salvador. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (2009); *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1034-35 (9th Cir. 2014) (concluding that petitioner did not establish the necessary “state action” for CAT relief).

Finally, the IJ did not abuse his discretion by denying Rojas’s request for a

continuance. *See Sandoval-Luna*, 526 F.3d at 1247.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**