

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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>MAUDIEL AMAYA-URBINA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

No. 08-70489

Agency No. A098-570-293

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.

Maudiel Amaya-Urbina, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture

---

\* 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).

(“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. This court reviews 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). This court reviews 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 petitioner’s claim that he is eligible for asylum or withholding of removal based upon an anti-gang political opinion or his membership in a particular social group. *See Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 854-56 (9th Cir. 2009); *Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 744-47 (9th Cir. 2008). Accordingly, because petitioner failed to demonstrate that he was or will be persecuted on account of a protected ground, we deny the petition as to his asylum and withholding of removal claims. *See Barrios*, 581 F.3d at 856.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT protection because petitioner failed to show it is more likely than not that he would be tortured if returned to El Salvador. *See Santos-Lemus*, 542 F.3d at 747-48.

Finally, we reject petitioner's allegation that the BIA issued a streamlined decision because it is belied by the record. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error to establish a due process violation).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**