

MAY 17 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>NORMAN DJUANA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 11-70088

Agency No. A079-566-536

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 14, 2013**

Before: LEAVY, THOMAS, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Norman Djuana, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to reopen. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for an abuse of discretion the

* 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).

BIA's denial of a motion to reopen. *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002). We deny the petition for review.

Djuana filed a motion to reopen with the BIA based on *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2009) and *Tampubolon v. Holder*, 610 F.3d 1056 (9th Cir. 2010). The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying Djuana's motion, where Djuana did not present any evidence of individualized risk of persecution. See *Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 979 (9th Cir. 2009); *Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1066 (“[a]n applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence to prevail than would an asylum applicant”). The record does not support Djuana's contention that the BIA failed to apply a disfavored group analysis to his claim. Accordingly, we deny the petition for review.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.