

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 24 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ENRIQUE DOQUE-LORENZANA, AKA
Enrique Henrry Duke,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 14-73545

Agency No. A201-114-227

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 16, 2016**

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Enrique Doque-Lorenzana, a native and citizen of Mexico, 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

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

removal and protection 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. *Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1012 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s determination that Doque-Lorenzana failed to establish past persecution or a fear of future persecution on account of an enumerated ground. *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*, 622 F.3d at 1016 (“An [applicant’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.”); *Molina-Morales v. INS*, 237 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2001) (harm based on personal retribution is not persecution on account of a protected ground). We reject Doque-Lorenzana’s contention that the agency erred in its analysis. Thus, Doque-Lorenzana’s withholding of removal claim fails.

Finally, substantial evidence also supports the BIA’s denial of CAT relief because Doque-Lorenzana failed to show it is more likely than not that he would

be tortured by the Mexican government, or with its consent or acquiescence. *See Silaya v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1066, 1073 (9th Cir. 2008).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.