

FEB 22 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SUNDAY SAUT LOMO PARULIAN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-73016

Agency No. A078-020-256

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 16, 2010\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, GOULD, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Sunday Saut Lomo Parulian, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for 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 concludes this case is 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. Reviewing for substantial evidence, *Lolong v. Gonzales*, 484 F.3d 1173, 1178 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc), we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that Parulian failed to establish past persecution. *See Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 101 6-17 (9th Cir. 2003). Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s conclusion that Parulian failed to establish a clear probability of future persecution because he has not provided sufficient evidence that he will be specifically targeted for persecution. *See Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2003).

Finally, substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Parulian failed to show it was more likely than not that he would be tortured in Indonesia. *See Singh v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 1100, 1113 (9th Cir. 2006).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**