

MAY 17 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NORMAN DJUANA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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.