

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUL 06 2009

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

SANDRA PATRICIA ARANA-  
HERNANDEZ,  
  
Petitioner,  
  
v.  
  
ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,  
  
Respondent.

No. 08-70081

Agency No. A097-400-193

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.

Sandra Patricia Arana-Hernandez, a native and citizen of Guatemala,  
petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order  
summarily affirming an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying her

---

\* 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).

application 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, *Ramos-Lopez v. Holder*, 563 F.3d 855, 858 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s finding that Arana-Hernandez failed to establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of a protected ground. *See id.* at 861-862; *see also Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 744-47 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that the group “young men in El Salvador resisting gang violence” is not a particular social group for purposes of asylum, and “general aversion to gangs does not constitute a political opinion for asylum purposes”). Accordingly, her asylum claim fails.

Because Arana-Hernandez failed to establish eligibility for asylum, she necessarily failed to meet the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s denial of CAT protection because Arana-Hernandez failed to show it is more likely than not that she would be tortured if returned to Guatemala. *See Santos-Lemus*, 542 F.3d at 747-48.

Arana-Hernandez's contention that the BIA violated due process by streamlining her case is foreclosed by *Falcon Carriche v. Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 850-52 (9th Cir. 2003).

In light of our disposition, we do not reach Arana-Hernandez's remaining contentions.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**