

JUL 15 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MUIRUM VELASQUEZ-PAGON,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 07-74967

Agency No. A099-577-021

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.

Muirum Velasquez-Pagon, a native and citizen of Honduras, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying her application for asylum,

* 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).

withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Parussimova v. Mukasey*, 555 F.3d 734, 738-39 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

The agency denied Velasquez-Pagon’s asylum application as time barred, and Velasquez-Pagon does not challenge this finding.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s conclusion that Velasquez-Pagon failed to establish that one central reason for the problems she experienced in Honduras was her sexual orientation. *See id.* at 740-41 (9th Cir. 2009) (“[t]he Real ID Act requires that a protected ground represent ‘one central reason’ for an asylum applicant’s persecution”). Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s determination that Velasquez-Pagon did not establish a clear probability of future persecution because her voluntary return trip to Honduras undermined her claim. *See Loho v. Mukasey*, 531 F.3d 1016, 1017-18 (9th Cir. 2008).

Velasquez-Pagon does not raise any arguments in her opening brief regarding the agency’s denial of her CAT claim. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.