

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 2 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

VIRGILIA DEL CARMEN RAMOS DE
ESPINOZA; AKA Carmen Carmen
Espinoza,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 14-71353

Agency No. A087-748-937

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted April 26, 2016**

Before: McKEOWN, WARDLAW, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Virgilia del Carmen Ramos de Espinoza, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her application 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).

asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that, even if credible, Ramos de Espinoza failed to demonstrate that the incidents she experienced in El Salvador rose to the level of persecution. *See Gu v. Gonzalez*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1020-21 (9th Cir. 2006); *Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1060 (petitioner failed to demonstrate harm to associates was part of “a pattern of persecution closely tied to” petitioner) (internal quotation and citation omitted). Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s determination that Ramos de Espinoza failed to establish a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of her political opinion. *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 2009) (petitioner “failed to make a compelling showing of the requisite objective component of a well-founded fear of persecution.”). Thus, her asylum claim fails.

Because Ramos de Espinoza failed to establish eligibility for asylum, her withholding of removal claim necessarily fails. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

Finally, Ramos de Espinoza does not make any substantive arguments challenging the agency's denial of her CAT claim. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 1996) ("Issues raised in a brief that are not supported by argument are deemed abandoned.").

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.