FILED

NOV 30 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PATRICIA JEANETH AREVALO-CONTRERAS, Petitioner, v. ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 08-71545 Agency No. A000-113-594 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.

Patricia Jeaneth Arevalo-Contreras, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' decision affirming the

---

[*] 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).

jlf/Inventory

immigration judge's denial of her 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, *Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 742 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition for review.

The record does not compel reversal of the IJ's conclusion that petitioner failed to establish that the harm she suffered at the hands of gang members in El Salvador was on account of a protected ground. *See Ramos-Lopez v. Holder*, 563 F.3d 855, 858-62 (9th Cir. 2009) (concluding that resistance to gang activity is not a particular social group for the purpose of establishing nexus to a protected ground); *Molina-Morales v. INS*, 237 F.3d 1048, 1051-52 (9th Cir. 2001) (personal retribution is not persecution on account of a protected ground). Accordingly, petitioner's asylum, withholding of removal, and CAT claims fail.

Contrary to petitioner's allegation, the BIA did not issue a streamlined decision, and the BIA's decision did not constitute a due process violation. *See Falcon-Cariche v. Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 849 (9th Cir. 2003). In addition, petitioner requests voluntary departure for the first time in this petition for review,

but this court lacks authority to provide such relief. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229c(a)(1); 8 C.F.R. § 1240.26.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.