

OCT 20 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

YORDY JESUS GRADOS-HINOJOSA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-74096

Agency No. A088-735-064

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 14, 2015**

Before: SILVERMAN, BYBEE, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Yordy Jesus Grados-Hinojosa, a native and citizen of Peru, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his 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). We deny the petition for review.

Grados-Hinojosa does not challenge the BIA’s finding that he waived any challenge to the IJ’s dispositive determination that his asylum claim was untimely. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not supported by argument are deemed abandoned). Thus, we deny the petition as to Grados-Hinojosa’s asylum claim.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s finding that Grados-Hinojosa did not establish past persecution, or that it is more likely than not he will be persecuted in the future, on account of a protected ground if returned to Peru. *See 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”); *see also Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (petitioner’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, we deny the petition as to Grados-Hinojosa’s withholding of removal claim.

Finally, Grados-Hinojosa does not raise any arguments challenging the

agency's denial of CAT relief. *See Martinez-Serrano*, 94 F.3d at 1259.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.