

FEB 25 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MARTA YOLANDA MOLINA-SOLARES,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 10-71470

Agency No. A098-176-827

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 17, 2015**

Before: O’SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and FERNANDEZ, Circuit Judges.

Marta Yolanda Molina-Solares, a native and citizen of Guatemala, 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 and withholding of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

* 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).

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

We lack jurisdiction over Molina-Solares’s unexhausted contention that she is a member of a social group based on her gender. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (court lacks jurisdiction to review claims not exhausted before the agency).

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s finding that Molina-Solares failed to establish that she was or will be harmed on account of her membership in a particular social group based on her family. *See Parussimova v. Mukasey*, 555 F.3d 734, 740 (9th Cir. 2009) (“a protected ground [must] represent “one central reason” for an asylum applicant’s persecution”); *see also Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (“An [applicant’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, Molina-Solares’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.