

JUL 22 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARIA DE LOS ANGELES MEJIA DE ZAMORA; et al.,</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. 10-70081

Agency Nos. A098-934-140
A098-934-141
A098-934-142
A098-934-144
A098-934-145

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.

Maria de los Angeles Mejia de Zamora and her family, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8

* 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).

U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s finding that petitioners failed to establish the extortion demands and threats from gang members were on account of their membership in a particular social group, political opinion, or any other protected ground. *See Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 747 (9th Cir. 2008) (evidence supported conclusion that gang victimized the petitioner for economic and personal reasons rather than on account of a protected ground); *Ochave v. INS*, 254 F.3d 859, 865 (9th Cir. 2001) (“Asylum generally is not available to victims of civil strife, unless they are singled out on account of a protected ground.”); *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”). Accordingly, because petitioners failed to demonstrate they were persecuted or fear persecution on account of a protected ground, we deny the petition as to petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.