

JUN 03 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>PEDRINA GUADALUPE BOLANOS- VENTURA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 08-74730

Agency No. A098-432-452

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 24, 2011**

Before: PREGERSON, THOMAS, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Pedrina Guadalupe Bolanos-Ventura, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against

* 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).

Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Nahrvani v. Gonzales*, 399 F.3d 1148, 1151 (9th Cir. 2005), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that Bolanos-Ventura did not establish past persecution based on her experiences in El Salvador. *See id.* at 1153-54 (two “serious” but anonymous threats coupled with harassment and *de minimis* property damage did not constitute past persecution). Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s conclusion that Bolanos-Ventura failed to establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See id.* at 1154 (fear of future persecution too speculative). Accordingly, Bolanos-Ventura’s asylum claim fails.

Because Bolanos-Ventura failed to establish eligibility for asylum, she necessarily failed to meet the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. *See id.*

Finally, Bolanos-Ventura fails to raise any substantive challenge to the denial of her CAT claim. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not addressed in the argument portion of a brief are deemed waived).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.