

DEC 13 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>EDWIN ADONAY MENDOZA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 09-71710

Agency No. A094-452-765

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted December 6, 2010**

Before: GOODWIN, RYMER, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Edwin Adonay Mendoza, 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 and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review

* 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).

for substantial evidence factual findings. *Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 742 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny the petition for review.

Mendoza contends he suffered harm from gang members during several incidents on account of his imputed political opinion. Substantial evidence supports the BIA's finding that the robberies were criminal in nature or to recruit him, and thus that Mendoza failed to establish the required nexus to a protected ground. *See Gormley v. Ashcroft*, 364 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 2004) (random criminal acts bore no nexus to a protected ground); *Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d at 745-46 (rejecting petitioner's contention that "the gang held any sort of belief system that they perceived [petitioner] to oppose"); *Parussimova v. Mukasey*, 555 F.3d 734, 740-41 (9th Cir. 2009) ("[t]he Real ID Act requires that a protected ground represent 'one central reason' for an asylum applicant's persecution"). Accordingly, Mendoza's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Ochoa v. Gonzales*, 406 F.3d 1166, 1172 (9th Cir. 2005).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.