FILED

DEC 19 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WAWAN GUNTORO HADI SEPUTRO, Petitioner, v. ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 12-71309 Agency No. A096-362-835 MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted December 17, 2013**

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Wawan Guntoro Hadi Seputro, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial

---

* 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).

evidence the agency's factual findings. *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009). We deny the petition for review.

As an initial matter, we deny Seputro's motion to take judicial notice of the 2010 and 2011 State Department reports and we do not consider them. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 963 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc) (the court's review is limited to the administrative record).

Seputro does not challenge the agency's past persecution finding. Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that, even under a disfavored group analysis, Seputro failed to show sufficient individualized risk to establish it is more likely than not he would be persecuted if removed to Indonesia. *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 978-79 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also 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"). We reject Seputro's contention that the IJ applied the disfavored group analysis incorrectly. We also reject Seputro's contention related to a pattern and practice of persecution of Christians in Indonesia. Accordingly, Seputro's withholding of removal claim fails.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.