

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 9 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ELMER SAUL CHAVARRIA-RAMIREZ,

No. 19-70504

Petitioner,

Agency No. A208-541-250

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted December 2, 2020\*\*

Before: WALLACE, CLIFTON, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Elmer Saul Chavarria-Ramirez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, 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 jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review factual findings for substantial

---

\* 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).

evidence. *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the finding that Chavarria-Ramirez failed to establish that the harm he experienced or fears in El Salvador was or would be on account of a protected ground. See *INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992) (an applicant “must provide *some* evidence of [motive], direct or circumstantial”); *Sagaydak v. Gonzales*, 405 F.3d 1035, 1042 (9th Cir. 2005) (to establish a nexus to a political opinion ground, petitioner must show “(1) that [he] had either an affirmative or imputed political opinion, and (2) that [he was] targeted *on account of* that opinion.”).

Substantial evidence also supports the BIA’s denial of CAT relief because Chavarria-Ramirez failed to show it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to El Salvador. See *Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

As stated in the court’s May 24, 2019 order, the temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**