

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 10 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RIMING LIU, AKA Ri Ming Liu,

No. 15-72420

Petitioner,

Agency No. A200-803-909

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted August 5, 2020\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, HAWKINS, and LEE, Circuit Judges.

Riming Liu, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings.

---

\* 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).

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

Liu does not challenge the agency's determination that he failed to establish past harm that rises to the level of persecution. *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). Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Liu did not establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1022 (9th Cir. 2006) (petitioner failed to present "compelling, objective evidence demonstrating a well-founded fear of persecution"). Thus, Liu's asylum claim fails.

In this case, because Liu failed to establish eligibility for asylum, he failed to establish eligibility for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye*, 453 F.3d at 1190.

Finally, Liu does not challenge the agency's determination that he failed to establish eligibility for CAT relief. *See Lopez-Vasquez*, 706 F.3d at 1079-80.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**