

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 11 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

TULIO TELLO-LOPES,

No. 17-72870

Petitioner,

Agency No. A205-063-026

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted May 6, 2020\*\*

Before: BERZON, N.R. SMITH, and MILLER, Circuit Judges.

Tulio Tello-Lopes, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions 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 de novo questions of law, *Cerezo v.*

---

\* 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).

*Mukasey*, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA’s interpretation of the governing statutes and regulations, *Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 535 (9th Cir. 2004). We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not err in finding that Tello-Lopes failed to establish membership in a cognizable social group. *See Reyes v. Lynch*, 842 F.3d 1125, 1131 (9th Cir. 2016) (in order to demonstrate membership in a particular social group, “[t]he applicant must ‘establish that the group is (1) composed of members who share a common immutable characteristic, (2) defined with particularity, and (3) socially distinct within the society in question.’” (quoting *Matter of M-E-V-G-*, 26 I. & N. Dec. 227, 237 (BIA 2014))); *see also Ramirez-Munoz v. Holder*, 816 F.3d 1226, 1228-29 (9th Cir. 2016) (concluding “imputed wealthy Americans” returning to Mexico did not constitute a particular social group); *Delgado-Ortiz v. Holder*, 600 F.3d 1148, 1151-52 (9th Cir. 2010) (concluding “returning Mexicans from the United States” did not constitute a particular social group).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Tello-Lopes otherwise failed to demonstrate that the harm he fears in Guatemala would be on account of a protected ground. *See 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”). Thus, Tello-Lopes’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Tello-Lopes failed to show it is more likely than not he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Guatemala. *See Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1067-68 (9th Cir. 2009) (no likelihood of torture).

We do not consider Tello-Lopes’ due process contention. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996) (“Issues raised in a brief that are not supported by argument are deemed abandoned.”).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**