

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 29 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CRISANTA HERNANDEZ PARRA, et al.,

No. 17-72674

Petitioners,

Agency Nos. A206-910-654

v.

A206-910-968

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

MEMORANDUM\*

Respondent.

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

Submitted October 22, 2018\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, GRABER, and GOULD, Circuit Judges

Crisanta Hernandez Parra and her granddaughter, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention

---

\* 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).

Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 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 the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s determination that petitioners failed to establish a nexus between past or future harm and a protected ground, including membership in a particular social group. *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1015-16 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also Ayala v. Holder*, 640 F.3d 1095, 1097 (9th Cir. 2011) (even if membership in a particular social group is established, an applicant must still show that “persecution was or will be *on account of* his membership in such group”) (emphasis in original). Thus, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Although petitioners reference CAT relief in their statement of issues, they do not make any arguments challenging the agency’s denial of CAT relief. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not specifically raised and argued in a party’s opening brief are waived).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**