

AUG 16 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JULIYANTI FRIDA SITORUS,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 08-74470

Agency No. A099-359-786

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 11, 2011**

Before: THOMAS, SILVERMAN, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Juliyanti Frida Sitorus, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying her application for withholding of removal.

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence,

* 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).

Wakkary v. Holder, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Sitorus’s experiences, including a physical assault in 1987 and her brother’s death from mob violence in 1998, even considered cumulatively, did not rise to the level of persecution. *See Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1016-18 (9th Cir. 2003).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s finding that, even as a member of a disfavored group, Sitorus failed to demonstrate a clear probability of future persecution because she did not establish sufficient individualized risk. *See Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1061-62, 1066 (“An applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence to prevail . . .”).

Accordingly, Sitorus’s withholding of removal claim fails.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.