

JUN 04 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DIAMOND KING LIM SANTOS, a.k.a.
Diamond Lin Santos,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 09-70095

Agency No. A070-693-073

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 25, 2010**

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

Diamond King Lim Santos, a native and citizen of the Philippines, 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 and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have

* 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).

jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1015 (9th Cir. 2003), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Santos failed to establish past persecution as a result of the threats the New People's Army made to his mother when he was a child. *See Hernandez-Ortiz v. Gonzales*, 496 F.3d 1042, 1045-46 (9th Cir. 2007). Substantial evidence also supports the agency's conclusion that Santos did not establish a clear probability of future persecution because Santos failed to show his mother's problems from the threats was closely tied to him. *See Arriaga-Barrientos v. INS*, 937 F.2d 411, 414 (9th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, Santos' withholding of removal claim fails.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of Santos' CAT claim because Santos failed to establish it was more likely than not he would be tortured if returned to the Philippines. *See El Himri v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 932, 938 (9th Cir. 2004).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.