

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 15 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RAQUEL LOPEZ-JIGUAN,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 18-70119

Agency No. A202-125-367

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted March 12, 2019**

Before: LEAVY, BEA, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Raquel Lopez-Jiguan, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review questions of law de novo, *Cerezo v.*

* 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).

Mukasey, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA’s determination 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. *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

In his opening brief, Lopez-Jiguan does not make any arguments regarding his claim of abuse by his father or fear of harm on account of imputed wealth. *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.”).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s finding that any past harm suffered by Lopez-Jiguan related to gang recruitment did not rise to the level of persecution. *See Guo v. Sessions*, 897 F.3d 1208, 1213 (9th Cir. 2018) (“Persecution is an extreme concept and has been defined as the infliction of suffering or harm upon those who differ (in race, religion or political opinion) in a way regarded as offensive.”); *see also Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1020-21 (9th Cir. 2006) (finding harm did not rise to the level of persecution where on one occasion petitioner was detained for three days, beaten, and interrogated). Further, the agency did not err in finding that Lopez-Jiguan did not establish membership in a cognizable social group. *See Reyes v. Lynch*, 842 F.3d 1125, 1131 (9th Cir. 2016) (in order to demonstrate membership in a particular group, “[t]he applicant

must ‘establish that the group is (1) composed of members who share a common immutable characteristic, (2) defined with particularity, and (3) socially distinct within the society in question’” (quoting *Matter of M-E-V-G-*, 26 I. & N. Dec. 227, 237 (BIA 2014))). Thus, we deny Lopez-Jiguan’s petition as to his asylum and withholding of removal claims.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Lopez-Jiguan failed to establish it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government of Guatemala. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.