

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

DEC 16 2009

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

MARGARETHA YULFRIEN
MATULANDI,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-70151

Agency No. A096-342-479

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.

Margaretha Yulfrien Matulandi, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her application for asylum, withholding

* 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).

of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1182 n. 4 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

In her opening brief, Matulandi fails to challenge the agency’s dispositive determination that her asylum claim is time-barred. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not supported by argument are deemed waived).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s finding that Matulandi failed to establish past persecution in Indonesia. *See Hoxha*, 319 F.3d at 1182. Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s finding that even as a member of a disfavored group, Matulandi failed to demonstrate a clear probability of future persecution. *See id.* at 1185. Further, the evidence does not compel the finding that Matulandi is a member of a group facing a pattern or practice of persecution. *See Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1060-62 (9th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, her withholding of removal claim fails.

Matulandi fails to raise any substantive arguments with respect to the agency's denial of CAT relief. *See Martinez-Serrano*, 94 F.3d at 1259-60.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.