

AUG 31 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ZEATLY KARAMONY,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

No. 07-74988

Agency No. A096-346-448

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted August 10, 2010\*\*

Before: LEAVY, HAWKINS, and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

Zeatly Karamony, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for withholding of removal.

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence,

---

\* 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).

*Lolong v. Gonzales*, 484 F.3d 1173, 1178 (9th Cir.2007) (en banc), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s denial of withholding because the harassment Karamony suffered during the 1998 riots does not rise to the level of persecution. *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 975-76 (9th Cir. 2009). Further, Karamony has not provided sufficient evidence that she has been, or is likely to be, specifically targeted for persecution as a Chinese Christian in Indonesia. *See Lolong*, 484 F.3d at 1180 n.4 (rejecting petitioner’s claim where she failed to show that she was “more likely to be targeted for persecution or harassment than any other member of Indonesia’s Chinese Christian community”); *see also Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1066 (9th Cir. 2009) (“An applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence to prevail”). Accordingly, Karamony’s withholding of removal claim fails.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**