

JUN 21 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 08-73913

Agency No. A098-964-718

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 15, 2011**

Before: CANBY, O’SANNLAIN, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Irene Melendez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions 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 factual findings, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006), and we review de novo due process claims, *Vasquez-Zavala v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 1105, 1107 (9th Cir. 2003). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's finding that Melendez failed to establish she suffered past persecution or has a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Molina-Morales v. INS*, 237 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2001); *see also 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”). We decline to consider whether Melendez’s family constitutes a particular social group because Melendez did not present that distinct argument to the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, Melendez’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Melendez failed to establish it is more likely than not that she will be tortured if returned to El Salvador. *See Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1067-68 (9th Cir. 2009).

Finally, Melendez's contention that she was denied due process because the BIA failed to provide a reasoned explanation for its decision is belied by the record. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (petitioner must show error and prejudice to establish a due process violation).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.