

NOV 29 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>SUSI LO,</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. 11-73204

Agency No. A088-320-499

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted November 19, 2013\*\*

Before: CANBY, TROTT, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Susi Lo, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8

---

\* 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).

U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence factual findings, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006), and we deny the petition for review.

Even if Lo's testimony was credible, substantial evidence supports the agency's finding that Lo failed to establish she suffered harm rising to the level of past persecution. *See Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1019 (9th Cir. 2006) (persecution "does not include every sort of treatment our society regards as offensive.") (internal quotations omitted). Substantial evidence also supports the finding that, even under a disfavored group analysis, Lo has not shown sufficient individualized risk to establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 977-79 (9th Cir. 2009); *cf. Sael v. Ashcroft*, 386 F.3d 922, 927-29 (9th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, Lo's asylum claim fails.

Because Lo failed to meet the lower burden of proof for asylum, it follows that she has not met the higher standard for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye*, 453 F.3d at 1190.

Finally, Lo did not challenge the agency's denial of her CAT claim. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not supported by argument are deemed waived).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**