

JUL 22 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GUANGWEI SUN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-73348

Agency No. A079-537-657

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 12, 2011**

Before: SCHROEDER, ALARCÓN, and LEAVY, Circuit Judges.

Guangwei Sun, a native and citizen of China, 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 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 the agency's factual findings. *See Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1018 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's findings that, even if credible, Sun failed to establish past persecution because her detention and physical mistreatment did not rise to the level of persecution. *See id.* at 1019-21 (detention, beating and interrogation did not compel a finding of past persecution by Chinese police on account of unsanctioned religious practice). Substantial evidence also supports the agency's finding that Sun failed to establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See id.* at 1022. Accordingly, Sun's asylum claim fails.

Because Sun did not meet the lower burden of proof for asylum, her claim for withholding of removal necessarily fails. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

Finally, substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Sun failed to show it is more likely than not she will be tortured if returned to China. *See Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1067-68 (9th Cir. 2009).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.