

OCT 3 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>YUSAK ROMPAS,</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. 13-71995

Agency No. A095-629-981

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 23, 2014 \*\*

Before: W. FLETCHER, RAWLINSON, and CHRISTEN, Circuit Judges.

Yusak Rompas, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge’s decision denying his application for 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. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's finding that the harms Rompas experienced in Indonesia, even considered cumulatively, did not rise to the level of persecution. *See Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1060 (9th Cir. 2009).

Substantial evidence also supports the BIA's finding that, even under a disfavored group analysis, Rompas failed to provide sufficient evidence of individualized harm to establish eligibility for withholding of removal. *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1066 (“An applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence to prevail than would an asylum applicant . . . .”). Thus, Rompas' withholding of removal claim fails.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**