

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 15 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

URBANO CAZAREZ-ACOSTA,

No. 18-70769

Petitioner,

Agency No. A205-297-822

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted March 12, 2019\*\*

Before: LEAVY, BEA, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Urbano Cazarez-Acosta, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' 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

---

\* 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).

jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. 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 record does not compel the conclusion that Cazarez-Acosta established changed circumstances to excuse his untimely asylum application. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1208.4(a)(4). Thus, Cazarez-Acosta's asylum claim fails.

Cazarez-Acosta fears harm in Mexico based on his family membership and as an Americanized returnee. Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Cazarez-Acosta failed to establish a nexus between the harm he fears and 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, Cazarez-Acosta's withholding of removal claim fails.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Cazarez-Acosta failed to establish it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government of Mexico. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

We reject Cazarez-Acosta's contention that the agency failed to consider

evidence of country conditions in Mexico.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**