

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 22 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

TIAN ZHENG,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 15-73305

Agency No. A205-187-548

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted July 14, 2020\*\*

Before: CANBY, FRIEDLAND, and R. NELSON, Circuit Judges.

Tian Zheng, a native and citizen of China, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings.

---

\* 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).

*Guo v. Sessions*, 897 F.3d 1208, 1212 (9th Cir. 2018). We grant in part and deny in part the petition for review, and we remand.

The record compels the conclusion that the cumulative harm Zheng suffered in China rose to the level of persecution. *See Guo*, 897 F.3d at 1213-17 (finding petitioner suffered past persecution because of his religious beliefs where he was detained, beaten, forced to sign a document promising not to attend a home church, and required to report to the police weekly); *see also Guo v. Ashcroft*, 361 F.3d 1194, 1203 (9th Cir. 2004) (totality of the circumstances compelled finding of persecution). Thus, we grant the petition for review as to Zheng's asylum and withholding of removal claims, and remand to the agency for further proceedings consistent with this disposition. *See Guo*, 897 F.3d at 1217; *see also INS v. Ventura*, 537 U.S. 12, 16-18 (2002) (per curiam).

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Zheng failed to show it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to China. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also Guo*, 897 F.3d at 1217 (insufficient likelihood of torture).

The government shall bear the costs for this petition for review.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED in part; DENIED in part;  
REMANDED.**