

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 13 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

GLORIA DOSAL CARRILLO,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 15-72887

Agency No. A206-548-737

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 9, 2020**

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, TASHIMA and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Gloria Dosal Carrillo, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her 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

* 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 Dosal Carrillo failed to establish she suffered harm that rose to the level of persecution. *See Tamang v. Holder*, 598 F.3d 1083, 1091-93 (9th Cir. 2010) (no past persecution where petitioner did not personally suffer harm). Substantial evidence also supports the agency's determination that Dosal Carrillo failed to establish the harm she fears in Mexico would be on account of 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"). Thus, Dosal Carrillo's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Dosal Carrillo failed to show it is more likely than not she would 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).

As stated in the court's February 23, 2016 order, the temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.