

JUL 13 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RICARDO MONTESINOS-BONILLA; 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. 07-73868

Agency Nos. A070-153-956
A200-022-675
A200-022-676
A200-022-677

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.

Ricardo Montesinos-Bonilla and his family, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying their application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under

* 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).

8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law, *Cerezo v. Mukasey*, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA’s determination of the governing statutes and regulations, *Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 535 (9th Cir. 2004). We review factual findings for substantial evidence. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

We reject petitioners’ claim they are eligible for asylum and withholding of removal based on their membership in a particular social group. *See Velasco-Cervantes v. Holder*, 593 F.3d 975, 978 (9th Cir. 2010) (rejecting as a particular social group “former material witnesses for the United States government”); *see also Soriano v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 1162, 1166 (9th Cir. 2009) (rejecting a proposed particular social group of “government informants”). Accordingly, because petitioners failed to demonstrate that they were or will be persecuted on account of a protected ground, we deny the petition as to their asylum and withholding of removal claims. *See Soriano*, 569 F.3d at 1166-67.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.