

JUL 06 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>EDUARD GEVORGYAN,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 05-70056

Agency No. A075-518-568

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 16, 2009**

Before: PAEZ, TALLMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Eduard Gevorgyan, a native and citizen of Armenia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum and

* 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).

withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Zhu v. Mukasey*, 537 F.3d 1034, 1038 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition for review.

Because Gevorgyan did not establish the Dashnak imputed a political opinion to him or that their attacks were on account of an imputed political opinion, substantial evidence supports the BIA's determination that Gevorgyan did not establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Sangha v. INS*, 103 F.3d 1482, 1489-90 (9th Cir. 1997).

Because Gevorgyan did not establish eligibility for asylum, it necessarily follows that he did not satisfy the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.