

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

FEB 24 2014

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

VIRGINIA DEL CARMEN RIVERA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-73366

Agency No. A072-523-249

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 18, 2014**

Before: ALARCÓN, O’SANNLAIN, and FERNANDEZ, Circuit Judges.

Virginia del Carmen Rivera, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture

* 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).

(“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s finding that, even if credible, Rivera failed to establish a nexus between any past or future harm in El Salvador and one of the protected grounds. *See Molina-Estrada v. INS*, 293 F.3d 1089, 1094-95 (9th Cir. 2002) (evidence did not compel finding that Guatemalan guerillas attacked family on account of imputed political opinion or membership in a particular social group); *Ochave v. INS*, 254 F.3d 859, 865 (9th Cir. 2001) (“Asylum generally is not available to victims of civil strife, unless they are singled out on account of a protected ground.”). Accordingly, Rivera’s asylum claim fails.

Because Rivera failed to meet the lower burden of proof for asylum, her claim for withholding of removal necessarily fails. *See Zehatye*, 453 F.3d at 1190.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Rivera failed to show it is more likely than not she will be tortured with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to El Salvador. *See Silaya v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1066, 1073 (9th Cir. 2008).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.