

JUN 22 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GERMAN ARMANDO BLANCO-RODRIGUEZ; MARIA ANTONIA MALLARINO,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-73070

Agency Nos. A099-345-247
A099-345-248

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 15, 2011**

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

German Armando Blanco-Rodriguez and Maria Antonia Mallarino, natives and citizens of Colombia, 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 application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence factual findings, *Ramos-Lopez v. Holder*, 563 F.3d 855, 858 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s denial of asylum and withholding of removal because petitioners failed to show that the kidnaping and threats experienced by Blanco-Rodriguez were motivated on account of a protected ground rather than by personal retribution. *See Molina-Morales v. INS*, 237 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2001) (“purely personal retribution is, of course, not persecution on account of” a protected ground); *Sangha v. INS*, 103 F.3d 1482, 1487 (9th Cir. 1997) (a petitioner cannot establish a nexus to a protected ground by inference “unless the inference is one that is clearly to be drawn from the facts in evidence”). In the absence of a nexus to a protected ground, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *Soriano v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 1162, 1167 (9th Cir. 2009).

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s denial of CAT relief because petitioners failed to establish it is more likely than not that they will be tortured on return to Colombia. *See Soriano v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 1162, 1167 (9th Cir. 2009).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.