

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 19 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

EDIL JOEL GARCIA-MARTINEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 22-1995

Agency No.
A094-290-457

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 10, 2023**

Before: S.R. THOMAS, McKEOWN, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Edil Joel Garcia-Martinez, a native and citizen of Honduras, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection 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. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241 (9th Cir. 2020). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Garcia-Martinez failed to establish he was or would be persecuted 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"); *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, his asylum claim fails. Because Garcia-Martinez failed to establish any nexus at all, he also failed to satisfy the standard for withholding of removal. *See Barajas-Romero v. Lynch*, 846 F.3d 351, 359-60 (9th Cir. 2017).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT protection because Garcia-Martinez 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 Honduras. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.