

FEB 22 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>BLANCA ODILIA RAMIREZ TISTA and ABELARDO AGUILAR RAMIREZ,</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. 10-71566

Agency Nos. A029-322-436  
A075-718-007

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 21, 2012\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, McKEOWN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Blanca Odilia Ramirez Tista and her son Abelardo Aguilar Ramirez, natives  
and citizens of Guatemala, petition for review of the decision of the Board of

---

\* 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).

Immigration Appeals dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge's denial of their applications for asylum and withholding of removal.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that petitioners did not establish past persecution based on petitioners being attacked and robbed by gang members because they failed to allege any nexus between the harm they suffered and one of the statutorily protected grounds. *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (“[a]n alien's desire to be free from harassment by criminals motivated by theft or random violence by gang members bears no nexus to a protected ground.”); *Sangha v. INS*, 103 F.3d 1482, 1489 (9th Cir. 1997) (a petitioner cannot establish a nexus to a protected ground by inference unless the inference is clear). Accordingly, because petitioners failed to demonstrate past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of a protected ground, we deny the petition for review as to their asylum and withholding of removal claims. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 482-83 (1992); *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**