

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 22 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ESTER NOHEMY ARIAS-PORTILLO; et
al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 23-479

Agency Nos.
A208-756-410
A208-756-386

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 14, 2023 **

Before: SILVERMAN, WARDLAW, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Ester Nohemy Arias-Portillo and her daughter, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their

* 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).

applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have 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 petitioners failed to establish they were or would be persecuted 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, petitioners’ asylum claim fails. Because petitioners failed to establish any nexus at all, they also failed to satisfy the standard for withholding of removal. *See Barajas-Romero v. Lynch*, 846 F.3d 351, 359-60 (9th Cir. 2017).

Because petitioners do not challenge the agency’s denial of CAT protection, we do not address it. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.