

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 11 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

YINGQIANG WANG,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 16-71116

Agency No. A205-551-615

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 8, 2020**

Before: TASHIMA, SILVERMAN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Yingqiang Wang, 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 application 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

* 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).

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 determination that Wang failed to establish he suffered harm that rises to the level of persecution. *See Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1019-21 (9th Cir. 2006) (detention, beating, and interrogation did not compel a finding of past persecution). Substantial evidence also supports the agency's determination that Wang did not establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See id.* at 1022 (petitioner failed to present "compelling, objective evidence demonstrating a well-founded fear of persecution"). Thus, Wang's asylum claim fails.

In this case, because Wang failed to establish eligibility for asylum, he failed to establish eligibility for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye*, 453 F.3d at 1190.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Wang 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).

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

As stated in the court's July 26, 2016 order, the temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.