

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

GRACIELA IDANIA CASTILLO-  
BARRERA; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 18-72031

Agency Nos. A208-154-956  
A208-154-957

MEMORANDUM\*

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.

Graciela Idania Castillo-Barrera and her son, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' 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”). Our jurisdiction is governed by 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 dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

In their opening brief, petitioners do not challenge the agency’s dispositive determination that they failed to establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution in El Salvador. Petitioners also fail to challenge the agency’s denial of withholding of removal. *See Corro-Barragan v. Holder*, 718 F.3d 1174, 1177 n.5 (9th Cir. 2013) (failure to contest issue in opening brief resulted in waiver).

We lack jurisdiction to consider petitioners’ contention regarding their family membership claim. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004) (court lacks jurisdiction to review claims not presented to the agency).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because petitioners failed to establish it is more likely than not they will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government of El Salvador. *See Delgado-Ortiz v. Holder*, 600 F.3d 1148, 1152 (9th Cir. 2010) (generalized evidence of violence and crime was not particular to the petitioner and insufficient to establish

eligibility for CAT relief).

We reject petitioners' contention that the agency erred in relying on new case law.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**