

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 21 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DAVID RUBALCAVA RAMOS,

No. 15-72710

Petitioner,

Agency No. A205-721-273

v.

MEMORANDUM*

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted May 15, 2018**

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

David Rubalcava Ramos, 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 ("IJ") 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 de novo questions of law, *Cerezo v. Mukasey*, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA's interpretation of the governing statutes and regulations, *Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 535 (9th Cir. 2004). We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings. *Silaya v. Mukasey*, 524 F.3d 1066, 1070 (9th Cir. 2008). We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to consider Rubalcava Ramos' contention as to the IJ's denial of his asylum claim because he failed to raise it to the BIA, and we lack jurisdiction to consider his contention as to cancellation of removal that he raises for the first time in his opening brief. *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 finding that Rubalcava Ramos failed to establish that the harm he suffered in Mexico was on account of a protected ground. *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (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").

Further, the agency did not err in finding that Rubalcava Ramos failed to establish membership in a cognizable social group. *See Ramirez-Munoz v. Lynch*, 816 F.3d 1226, 1228-29 (9th Cir. 2016) (concluding that “imputed wealthy Americans” returning to Mexico does not constitute a particular social group); *see also Delgado-Ortiz v. Holder*, 600 F.3d 1148, 1151-52 (9th Cir. 2010) (concluding “returning Mexicans from the United States” does not constitute a particular social group). Thus, Rubalcava Ramos’ withholding of removal claim fails.

Finally, substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Rubalcava Ramos failed to show it is more likely than not that he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government of Mexico. *See Ramirez-Munoz*, 816 F.3d at 1230.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.