

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 19 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

FELICITAS BARRAZA-PEREZ; et al.,

No. 14-73348

Petitioners,

Agency Nos. A201-275-588

v.

A201-275-579

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

A201-275-569

A201-275-571

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 17, 2020**

Before: SCHROEDER, TROTT, and SILVERMAN, Circuit Judges.

Felicitas Barraza-Perez, Luis Enrique Gradilla-Arevalo, Luis Manuel Gradilla-Gomez, and Yuliza Guadalupe Gradilla-Gomez (“Petitioners”), natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeals from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision

* 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).

denying their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”).

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. The BIA summarily affirmed the IJ’s decision under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(e)(4), so we review the IJ’s decision as the final agency action. *Alvarado v. Holder*, 759 F.3d 1121, 1126 (9th Cir. 2014). We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that Petitioners failed to establish they would be persecuted on account of a protected ground. Although their testimony was credible and sincere, the respondents do not know who was threatening them or why they were being threatened. They can only speculate that the threats had something to do with their murdered grandfather’s involvement in drug trafficking. *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, Petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT protection because Petitioners 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*

Aden v. Holder, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.