

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

DEC 4 2014

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

CARLOS G. FLORES-PACHECO,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-70733

Agency No. A075-251-422

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 18, 2014**

Before: LEAVY, FISHER, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Carlos G. Flores-Pacheco, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review

* 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).

for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

Flores-Pacheco contends the agency erred in finding he did not have an objective basis to fear persecution based on his father’s past political activity.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s determination that Flores-Pacheco failed to establish a well-founded fear of persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Molina-Estrada v. INS*, 293 F.3d 1089, 1095-96 (9th Cir. 2002) (insufficient evidence to show reasonable fear of future persecution); *see also 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”); *Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (“[a]n alien’s desire to be free from harassment by criminals motivated by theft or random violence by gang members bears no nexus to a protected ground”). Thus, Flores-Pacheco’s asylum claim fails.

Because Flores-Pacheco failed to meet the lower standard of proof for asylum, his claim for withholding of removal necessarily fails. *See Zehatye*, 453 F.3d at 1190.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.