

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 17 2020

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MAX ROMERO-URTIJE, AKA Francisco
Maximiliano Roman-Salgado, AKA
Maximiliano Romero-Francisco,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 19-70832

Agency No. A095-804-715

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.

Max Romero-Urtije, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his 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).

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. 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.

In his opening brief, Romero-Urtije does not challenge the agency’s determination that his asylum application was time barred. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not specifically raised and argued in a party’s opening brief are waived).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Romero-Urtije failed to demonstrate a nexus between the harm he fears in Mexico and his family membership. *See Ayala v. Holder*, 640 F.3d 1095, 1097 (9th Cir. 2011) (even if membership in a particular social group is established, an applicant must still show that “persecution was or will be *on account of* his membership in such group”). Thus, Romero-Urtije’s withholding of removal claim fails.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Romero-Urtije failed to show it is more likely than not he 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).

Romero-Urtije’s contention that the IJ lacked jurisdiction over his proceedings is foreclosed by *Aguilar Fermin v. Barr*, 958 F.3d 887, 895 (9th Cir. 2020) (omission of certain information from notice to appear can be cured for

jurisdictional purposes by later hearing notice).

As stated in the court's May 24, 2019 order, the temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.