

OCT 27 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ROBERTA TZIB, a.k.a. Maria de Jesus
Paniagua Padilla,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-75152

Agency No. A099-629-783

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 19, 2010**

Before: O’SANNLAIN, TALLMAN, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Roberta Tzib, a native and citizen of Belize, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying her 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, *INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 n.1 (1992), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's conclusion that, even if credible, Tzib failed to establish her gang-affiliated nephew and his friends threatened her on account of a protected ground. *See Bolshakov v. INS*, 133 F.3d 1279, 1280-81 (9th Cir. 1998) (criminal street gang activity does not establish persecution on account of a protected ground); *see also Parussimova v. Mukasey*, 555 F.3d 734, 740-41 (9th Cir. 2009) ("The Real ID Act requires that a protected ground represent 'one central reason' for an asylum applicant's persecution").

Accordingly, we deny the petition as to Tzib's asylum and withholding of removal claims. *See Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 856 (9th Cir. 2009).

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Tzib failed to show it is more likely than not she would be tortured if returned to Belize. *See Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 747-48 (9th Cir. 2008).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.