

SEP 27 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARTIN BRITO,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 12-70263

Agency No. A094-461-353

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 24, 2013**

Before: RAWLINSON, N.R. SMITH, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Martin Brito, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal.

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).

the agency's factual findings, *Husyev v. Mukasey*, 528 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition for review.

The record does not compel the conclusion that Brito filed his asylum application within a reasonable period after withdrawal of his temporary protected status. *See id.* at 1181-82. Thus, we deny the petition as to his asylum claim.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Brito failed to establish the incident he experienced in El Salvador rose to the level of persecution. *See Prasad v. INS*, 47 F.3d 336, 339-40 (9th Cir. 1995) (single incident of detention and beating did not compel finding of past persecution).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's finding that Brito failed to meet his burden of proof for withholding of removal because he did not show it is more likely than not he will be persecuted in El Salvador. *See Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1018 (9th Cir. 2003) (possibility of future persecution too speculative). Thus, we deny the petition as to his withholding of removal claim.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.