

SEP 22 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 08-73339

Agency No. A200-052-064

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 13, 2010\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, CALLAHAN and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

William Rivera, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief 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 factual findings, *INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 & n.1 (1992), and de novo due process claims, *Vasquez-Zavala v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 1105, 1107 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's finding that Rivera failed to demonstrate he suffered past persecution or has a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. at 483.

Because Rivera failed to meet the lower burden of proof for asylum, it follows that he has not met the higher standard for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Rivera has not established that any torture he may suffer would be by or with the acquiescence of the Salvadoran government. *See Silaya v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1066, 1073 (9th Cir. 2008).

We reject Rivera's due process claim because he has not shown how he has been prejudiced by any error. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2006) (petitioner must show error and prejudice to establish a due process violation).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**