

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 22 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

LORENA G. MOLINA MENJIVAR,

No. 19-72344

Petitioner,

Agency No. A215-674-989

v.

MEMORANDUM*

ROBERT M. WILKINSON, Acting
Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted January 20, 2021**

Before: McKEOWN, CALLAHAN, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Lorena G. Molina Menjivar, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's 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).

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241 (9th Cir. 2020). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Molina Menjivar failed to establish the harm she experienced or fears in El Salvador was or 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, Molina Menjivar's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Molina Menjivar failed to show it is more likely than not she would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if she returned to El Salvador. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate. The motion for a stay of removal (Docket Entry No. 1) is otherwise denied.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.