

JUL 07 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JULIO ARRESCURRENAGA; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>

No. 07-70967

Agency Nos. A075-540-994
 A075-540-995
 A075-540-996
 A075-540-997

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 29, 2010 **

Before: ALARCÓN, LEAVY, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Julio Arrescurrenaga and Jacinta Malaver (“adult petitioners”), and their children Carolina and Andrea, natives and citizens of Peru, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order affirming the immigration judge’s decision denying their applications for asylum and 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).

application. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law and review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings. *See Cruz-Navarro v. INS*, 232 F.3d 1024, 1028 (9th Cir. 2000). We deny in part and grant in part the petition for review.

The BIA found that adult petitioners had failed to establish past persecution because the attacks they suffered were inherent risks in their duties as police officers. The record does not compel the conclusion that adult petitioners suffered harm on account of their actual or imputed political opinion, or as members of a particular social group consisting of police officers. *See id.* at 1029–30.

Substantial evidence also supports the BIA's finding that adult petitioners do not have a well-founded fear of future persecution based on their status as former police officers because they failed to show that the government is unwilling or unable to protect them. *See Nahrvani v. Gonzales*, 399 F.3d 1148, 1153–54 (9th Cir. 2005).

Andrea and Carolina argued to the BIA that they suffered past persecution and have a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of their membership in a particular social group, namely their family. The BIA, however, did not address their claims. Accordingly, we grant the petition with respect to Andrea and Carolina's claims and remand for the BIA to address them in the first instance.

See Sagadyak v. Gonzales, 405 F.3d 1035, 1040 (9th Cir. 2005) (“the BIA [is] not free to ignore arguments raised by a petitioner”); *see also INS v. Ventura*, 537 U.S. 12, 16–18 (2002) (per curiam). We also grant the petition and remand as to Carolina’s claim that she is eligible for humanitarian asylum relief under 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(b)(1)(iii)(B), due to her growth hormone deficiency, because the BIA also failed to address this claim. *See id.*

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; GRANTED in part;
REMANDED.**