

SEP 28 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 07-74702

Agency No. A096-496-734

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.

Ariffin Darmawan, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for 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, *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s determination that the isolated mall incident and general harassment and discrimination Darmawan experienced, even considered cumulatively, did not rise to the level of persecution. *See id.* at 1059-60. Further, even as a member of a disfavored group, Darmawan failed to demonstrate the requisite individualized risk of persecution. *See Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1066 (“An applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence to prevail”). Accordingly, Darmawan’s withholding of removal claim fails.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s denial of CAT relief because Darmawan failed to establish it is more likely than not he will be tortured if returned to Indonesia. *See id.* at 1067-68.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.