

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 15 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MANUEL RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-72485

Agency No. A094-822-493

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted August 9, 2017\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, TASHIMA, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Manuel Rodriguez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").

---

\* 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).

Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings, *Silaya v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1066, 1070 (9th Cir. 2008), and we review de novo due process contentions, *Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 535 (9th Cir. 2004). We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to consider Rodriguez's contentions regarding asylum, withholding of removal, and Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11378 because he failed to raise these claims before the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004) (court lacks jurisdiction to review claims not presented to the agency).

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of Rodriguez's CAT claim because he failed to establish it is more likely than not he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Mexico. *See Silaya*, 524 F.3d at 1073; *Zheng v. Holder*, 644 F.3d 829, 835-36 (9th Cir. 2011) (claims of future torture were speculative). Thus, his CAT claim fails.

We reject Rodriguez's contention that the BIA violated his due process rights. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error to prevail on a due process claim).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**