

MAR 02 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SHAMZU BOHRA JUMA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 06-71681

Agency No. A096-051-987

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 18, 2009**

Before: BEEZER, FERNANDEZ, and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Shamzu Bohra Juma, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her application for withholding of removal

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case 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 for substantial evidence, *Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1015 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA denied Juma’s asylum application as time-barred. Juma does not challenge this finding in her opening brief.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s finding that Juma failed to establish that she suffered past persecution, *see Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1182 (9th Cir. 2003), and the record does not compel the conclusion that she demonstrated a clear probability of future persecution on account of an imputed political opinion if returned to Ethiopia, *see Sangha v. INS*, 103 F.3d 1482, 1489-91 (9th Cir. 1997). Accordingly, her withholding of removal claim fails.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s denial of CAT relief because Juma failed to establish that it is more likely than not she would be tortured if returned to Ethiopia. *See Malhi v. INS*, 336 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2003).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.