

JUN 11 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>CHRISTONY HARAHAAP and CHANDRA SARAGIH,</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. 10-70221

Agency Nos.       A096-356-388  
                              A096-364-570

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted June 7, 2013\*\*  
Pasadena, California

Before: GOULD and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges, and DU, District Judge.\*\*\*

Petitioners Christony Harahap and Chandra Saragih, natives and citizens of  
Indonesia, seek review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA)

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent  
except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision  
without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

\*\*\* The Honorable Miranda Du, District Judge for the U.S. District Court  
for the District of Nevada, sitting by designation.

affirming an Immigration Judge's denial of their claims for withholding of removal. Petitioners did not challenge the BIA's denial of their applications for asylum or for protection under Convention Against Torture; therefore, these claims are waived. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252, and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's finding that Petitioners did not suffer past persecution. Petitioners were victims of crime and discrimination at least in part on account of their Christian faith. However, these experiences, considered individually or cumulatively, do not compel the conclusion that Petitioners suffered past persecution. *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1059–60 (9th Cir. 2009).

Substantial evidence also supports the BIA's conclusion that Petitioners are not entitled to withholding of removal based on their disfavored-group status. Petitioners' "showing of 'disfavor' was relatively low, [so] it only slightly offsets the need to show individual risk." *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 979 (9th Cir. 2009). Petitioners' individual claims were undercut by their families' continued residence in Indonesia without harm. *Sinha v. Holder*, 564 F.3d 1015, 1022 (9th Cir. 2009). Petitioners did not demonstrate sufficient individualized risk to show it is more likely than not that they would be persecuted in Indonesia. *See 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”).

**DENIED.**