

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 13 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

NORA ESTELA CORNEJO-DE FRANCO;
et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 18-72950

Agency Nos. A208-170-459
A208-170-313
A208-170-456
A208-170-457
A208-170-458

MEMORANDUM*

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.

Nora Cornejo-De Franco, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se on behalf of herself, her husband, and her three children for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their applications for asylum, withholding of removal,

* 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).

and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review the agency’s factual findings for substantial evidence. *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s finding that Cornejo-De Franco failed to establish that the harm she and her family suffered or fear in El Salvador was or 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, Cornejo-De Franco’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In her opening brief, Cornejo-De Franco does not challenge the BIA’s denial of her CAT claim. *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 CAT relief.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.