

NOV 24 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FREDDY JORDAN MENDOZA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 14-70885

Agency No. A087-448-857

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 18, 2015**

Before: TASHIMA, OWENS, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Freddy Jordan Mendoza, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for

* 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).

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.

Mendoza claims a fear of future mistreatment on account of a particular social group of long-term residents of the United States who are Mexican nationals being sent back to Mexico. Substantial evidence supports the BIA's finding that Mendoza failed to establish a nexus between his social group and the criminal harm he fears. *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, Mendoza's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Finally, we grant respondent's motion to withdraw its previous non-opposition to a stay of removal, and we deny Mendoza's request for a stay of removal. *See Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 426 (2009).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.