

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

AUG 03 2015

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

CELINA CARMEN DURAN,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 11-70911

Agency No. A099-580-002

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 21, 2015**

Before: CANBY, BEA, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Celina Carmen Duran, 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 withholding of

* 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).

removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We grant the petition for review and remand.

In denying Duran's withholding of removal claim, the BIA found Duran failed to establish a nexus between the mistreatment she suffered or fears and a protected ground. As the government concedes, when the BIA issued its decision in this case it did not have the benefit of this court's decisions in *Henriquez-Rivas v. Holder*, 707 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 2013) (en banc), *Cordoba v. Holder*, 726 F.3d 1106 (9th Cir. 2013), and *Pirir-Boc v. Holder*, 750 F.3d 1077 (9th Cir. 2014), or the BIA's decisions in *Matter of M-E-V-G-*, 26 I. & N. Dec. 227 (BIA 2014) and *Matter of W-G-R-*, 26 I. & N. Dec. 208 (BIA 2014). Thus, we remand Duran's withholding of removal claim to determine the impact, if any, of these decisions. *See INS v. Ventura*, 537 U.S. 12, 16-18 (2002) (per curiam).

PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED; REMANDED.