

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 16 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

REYNA ISABEL ORTIZ ELIAS, AKA
Reyna Ortiz Elias,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 16-70332

Agency No. A200-696-589

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.

Reyna Isabel Ortiz Elias, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").

* 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).

Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings, including determinations regarding social distinction. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241-42 (9th Cir. 2020). We review de novo the legal question of whether a particular social group is cognizable, except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA's interpretation of the governing statutes and regulations. *Id.* We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Ortiz Elias failed to establish her proposed social group is socially distinct. *See id.* at 1243 (substantial evidence supported the agency's determination that petitioner's proposed social group was not cognizable because of the absence of society-specific evidence of social distinction). Thus, the BIA did not err in concluding that Ortiz Elias did not establish membership in a cognizable particular social group. *See Reyes v. Lynch*, 842 F.3d 1125, 1131 (9th Cir. 2016) (in order to demonstrate membership in a particular social group, "[t]he applicant must 'establish that the group is (1) composed of members who share a common immutable characteristic, (2) defined with particularity, and (3) socially distinct within the society in question'" (quoting *Matter of M-E-V-G-*, 26 I. & N. Dec. 227, 237 (BIA 2014))).

To the extent Ortiz Elias fears harm based on general conditions of violence

and civil unrest, substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that she failed to establish a nexus to 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 the new particular social group raised in Ortiz Elias' opening brief. *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, Ortiz Elias' asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Ortiz Elias 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 El Salvador. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009). We lack jurisdiction to consider Ortiz Elias' contention that the IJ erred in analyzing her CAT claim. *See Barron*, 358 F.3d at 677-78.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.