

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**FILED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MAY 26 2021

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

KE DA FU,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 20-71805

Agency No. A075-502-854

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted May 18, 2021\*\*

Before: CANBY, FRIEDLAND, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Ke Da Fu, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial

---

\* 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).

evidence the 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 Fu did not establish a well-founded fear of persecution. *See Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1022 (9th Cir. 2006) (applicant failed "to present compelling, objective evidence demonstrating a well-founded fear of persecution"); *Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000) (two-year period of continued residence without harm following the incident that formed the basis of the applicant's claim did not support an objective fear of persecution). Thus, Fu's asylum claim fails.

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

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

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate. The motion for a stay of removal is otherwise denied.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**