

NOV 30 2009

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

xNOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MELSIK DANIELYAN,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>

No. 08-70952

Agency No. A095-313-076

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 17, 2009**

Before: ALARCÓN, TROTT, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Melsik Danielyan, a native and citizen of Armenia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order summarily affirming an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum, 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 protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence findings of fact, *Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1018 (9th Cir. 2006), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s conclusion that Danielyan did not establish past persecution because the beating he experienced at the hands of the Armenian police and subsequent job loss did not rise to the level of persecution. *See Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1019-21 (9th Cir. 2006); *see also Khourassany v. INS*, 208 F.3d 1096, 1100-01 (9th Cir. 2000). Furthermore, substantial evidence supports the IJ’s conclusion that Danielyan failed to establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See Gu*, 454 F.3d at 1021-22.

Because Danielyan 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).

Danielyan has failed to set forth any substantive argument regarding the agency’s denial of CAT relief. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not supported by argument are deemed waived).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.