

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 17 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BRENDA LILIANA LINARES,

No. 20-72570

Petitioner,

Agency No. A206-914-408

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted March 14, 2023\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, SUNG, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

Brenda Liliana Linares, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture

---

\* 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).

(“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo the legal question of whether a particular social group is cognizable, except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA’s interpretation of the governing statutes and regulations. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241-42 (9th Cir. 2020). We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Id.* at 1241. We deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not err in concluding that Linares failed to establish membership in a cognizable particular social group. *See Reyes v. Lynch*, 842 F.3d 1125, 1131 (9th Cir. 2016) (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 Villegas Sanchez v. Garland*, 990 F.3d 1173, 1180 (9th Cir. 2021) (“Social distinction requires ‘those with a common immutable characteristic [to be] set apart, or distinct, from other persons within the society in some significant way.’” (internal quotations and citations omitted)). Thus, Linares’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we do not reach Linares’ remaining contentions regarding her asylum and withholding of removal claims. *See Simeonov v.*

*Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT protection because Linares failed to show it is more likely than not she 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); *Zheng v. Holder*, 644 F.3d 829, 835-36 (9th Cir. 2011) (possibility of torture too speculative).

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until the mandate issues.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**