

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 18 2019

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

GABIER HESMI MONGE; CANDELARIA  
LOPEZ MORALES,

Petitioners,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 18-73471

Agency Nos. A206-270-449  
A206-270-443

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted December 11, 2019\*\*

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

Gabier Hesmi Monge and Candelaria Lopez Morales, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying their application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention

---

\* 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).

Against Torture (“CAT”). Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1031 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Petitioners do not meaningfully challenge the agency’s determination that they failed to establish that the harm they suffered or fear in Mexico was or would be on account of a protected ground. *See Rizk v. Holder*, 629 F.3d 1083, 1091 n.3 (9th Cir. 2011) (a petitioner waives an issue by failing to raise it in the opening brief). Thus, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of petitioners’ CAT claim because they failed to show it is more likely than not they will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Mexico. *See Garcia-Milian*, 755 F.3d at 1033-35 (concluding that petitioner did not establish the necessary state action for CAT relief).

We lack jurisdiction to consider petitioners’ contentions regarding IJ error or persecution based on political opinion because they did not exhaust them 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).

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