

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 7 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

HECTOR ADRIAN RAMOS LOPEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 16-73190

Agency No. A094-476-339

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 4, 2020**

Before: FERNANDEZ, SILVERMAN, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Hector Adrian Ramos Lopez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, 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 relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial

* 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).

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

Ramos Lopez does not challenge the agency's dispositive determination that his asylum application was untimely. *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, we deny the petition for review as to his asylum claim.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Ramos Lopez failed to establish the Salvadoran government was or would be unable or unwilling to control the gangs. *See Nahrvani v. Gonzales*, 399 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2005) (record did not compel finding petitioner faced persecution by forces the government was unable or unwilling to control). We reject Ramos Lopez's contentions that the agency erred in its analysis of his claim. Thus, Ramos Lopez's withholding of removal claim fails.

We do not address Ramos Lopez's contentions as to harm rising to the level of persecution and cognizability of his particular social group because the BIA did not reach those issues. *See Santiago-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 657 F.3d 820, 829 (9th Cir. 2011) ("In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency." (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Finally, substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Ramos Lopez 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 El Salvador. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1033-35 (9th Cir. 2014) (concluding that petitioner did not establish the necessary “state action” for CAT relief).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.