

AUG 13 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

| |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>MEDARDO SANTIAGO ALONZO,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

No. 09-71584

Agency No. A071-531-967

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 8, 2012**

Before: ALARCÓN, BERZON, and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

Medardo Santiago Alonzo, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum. 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).

factual findings. *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009). We deny the petition for review.

Santiago Alonzo contends that he was persecuted and has a well-founded fear of persecution on account of his political opinion based on threatening letters he received and a visit by armed men to his home. Substantial evidence supports the agency's conclusion that Santiago Alonzo did not establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution because he did not show a nexus between these incidents and his actual or imputed political opinion. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992) (petitioner must provide some evidence, direct or circumstantial, of persecutor's motive); *Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 856 (9th Cir. 2009) (petitioner did not show gang imputed any particular political belief to him). Accordingly, his asylum claim fails. *See Ochoa v. Gonzales*, 406 F.3d 1166, 1172 (9th Cir. 2005).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.