

OCT 01 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FELINCIA PHANG; HENDRICK
LIAUW,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-70988

Agency Nos. A088-102-228
A088-102-229

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.

Felincia Phang and Hendrick Liauw, natives and citizens of Indonesia, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying their application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

* 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).

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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s finding that Phang failed to establish she suffered past persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Parussimova v. Mukasey*, 555 F.3d 734, 740 (9th Cir. 2009) (the REAL ID Act “requires that a protected ground represent ‘one central reason’ for an asylum applicant’s persecution”); *see also Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 975-76 (9th Cir. 2009) (incidents of mistreatment, including being stripped naked in front of classmates, beaten by rioters, and false arrest and detention, did not compel finding of past persecution). Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s finding that, even under a disfavored group analysis, Phang failed to demonstrate sufficient individualized risk of harm to establish a well-founded fear of persecution in Indonesia. *See Halim*, 590 F.3d at 977-979; *cf. Sael v. Ashcroft*, 386 F.3d 922, 927-29 (9th Cir. 2004). We reject Phang’s contention that the BIA applied the disfavored group analysis incorrectly. Accordingly, Phang’s asylum claim fails.

Because Phang failed to meet the lower burden of proof for asylum, her withholding of removal claim necessarily fails. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.