

MAR 14 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ANA CAROLINA CANALES- ESTRADA and TATIANA CANALES- ESTRADA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioners,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>

No. 08-75109

Agency Nos. A096-181-851
A096-181-852

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted March 8, 2011**

Before: FARRIS, O’SCANNLAIN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Ana Carolina Canales-Estrada and Tatiana Canales-Estrada, natives and citizens of Honduras, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s decision

* 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).

denying their applications for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006), and deny the petition for review.

Contrary to petitioners' contention, the BIA did not question their credibility, instead finding that even if petitioners identified a cognizable social group of young Christian women who oppose losing their virginity and/or Christian values and consequently refuse to acquiesce to sexual advances of gang members, the evidence did not support their assertion that gang members targeted them on this basis. Substantial evidence supports that finding. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 n.1 (1992) (to reverse the agency's finding "we must find that the evidence not only *supports* that conclusion, but *compels* it") (emphasis in original). Accordingly, petitioners' asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Ochoa v. Gonzales*, 406 F.3d 1166, 1172 (9th Cir. 2005).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.