

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 11 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ALBERTO MONTIEL-RIVERA,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 17-72884

Agency No. A205-868-015

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 6, 2020**

Before: BERZON, N.R. SMITH, and MILLER, Circuit Judges.

Alberto Montiel-Rivera, 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 decision denying his application for withholding of removal and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's

* 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).

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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Montiel-Rivera failed to demonstrate a nexus between the harm he experienced or fears in Mexico and 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"). We lack jurisdiction to consider Montiel-Rivera's contentions regarding a new social group that he did not raise to the agency. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004) (court lacks jurisdiction to review claims not presented to the agency). Thus, Montiel-Rivera's withholding of removal claim fails.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Montiel-Rivera failed to show 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 Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1067-68 (9th Cir. 2009) (no likelihood of torture).

The record does not support Montiel-Rivera's contentions that the BIA failed to consider evidence or otherwise erred in its analysis of his claims.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.