

AUG 16 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CHEE-KET WONG,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 11-72856

Agency No. A077-074-977

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 14, 2013**

Before: SCHROEDER, GRABER, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Chee-Ket Wong, a native and citizen of Malaysia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for withholding of removal.

* 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). Thus, we deny Wong's request for oral argument.

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings, *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

Wong does not contend that he suffered past persecution. Rather, he contends that he faces a clear probability of future persecution based on his Christian religion and Chinese ethnicity. Substantial evidence supports the BIA's finding that, even under a disfavored group analysis, Wong failed to show sufficient individualized risk to establish that it is more likely than not he would be persecuted if removed to Malaysia. *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”). Accordingly, Wong's withholding of removal claim fails.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.