

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 13 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ELDER BENJAMIN CANUT-REYES,

No. 15-73264

Petitioner,

Agency No. A071-581-897

v.

MEMORANDUM*

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted December 11, 2019**

Before: WALLACE, CANBY, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Elder Benjamin Canut-Reyes, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings. *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026,

* 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).

1031 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Canut-Reyes failed to establish that his past harm rose to the level of persecution. *See Lim v. INS*, 224 F.3d 929, 936 (9th Cir. 2000) (persecution is an "extreme concept" that includes the "infliction of suffering or harm"); *Duran-Rodriguez v. Barr*, 918 F.3d 1025, 1028 (9th Cir. 2019) (threats alone "rarely constitute persecution").

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's determination that Canut-Reyes failed to establish the harm he fears in Guatemala would be 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."). Thus, his withholding of removal claim fails.

In light of this disposition, we do not reach Canut-Reyes' remaining contentions. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.