

JUN 04 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>VICENTA CORDOVA; et al.,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---

No. 08-73583

Agency Nos. A200-057-571  
A200-057-570  
A200-057-560

MEMORANDUM \*

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

Submitted May 25, 2010\*\*  
San Francisco, California

Before: CANBY, THOMAS and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Vicenta Cordova and her two children, German Cordova-Cordova and Jose Antonio Cordova-Cordova, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals order dismissing their appeal from an

---

\* 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).

immigration judge's decision denying their application for asylum, withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review factual findings for substantial evidence, *Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 742 (9th Cir. 2008), and deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the Board's denial of asylum and withholding of removal because petitioners failed to show their alleged persecutors threatened them on account of a protected ground. Their fear of future persecution based on an actual or imputed anti-gang or anti-crime opinion is not on account of the protected ground of either membership in a particular social group or political opinion. *See Ramos Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 854-56 (9th Cir. 2009); *Santos-Lemus* at 745-46; *see Ochave v. INS*, 254 F.3d 859, 865 (9th Cir. 2001) (“Asylum generally is not available to victims of civil strife, unless they are singled out on account of a protected ground.”).

Substantial evidence also supports the Board's denial of CAT relief based on the Board's finding that petitioners did not establish a likelihood of torture by, at the instigation of, or with the consent or acquiescence of the El Salvadoran government. *See Arteaga v. Mukasey*, 511 F.3d 940, 948-49 (9th Cir. 2007).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**