

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

OCT 26 2015

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MOISES VELASQUEZ-MEDINA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-70281

Agency No. A088-892-353

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted October 14, 2015\*\*

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

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

---

\* 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).

evidence the agency's factual findings. *Zhao v. Mukasey*, 540 F.3d 1027, 1030 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's finding that, even if credible, Velasquez-Medina failed to establish past persecution or a clear probability of future persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1015-1016 (9th Cir. 2010); *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"). We reject Velasquez-Medina's contention that the agency decisions do not provide adequate reasoning to allow a meaningful review. Thus, Velasquez-Medina's withholding of removal claim fails.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**