

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 12 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RUTH NUNEZ-CAMPOS, AKA Ruth
Nunez-De Bayona,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 20-70942

Agency No. A095-764-364

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 8, 2021**
Pasadena, California

Before: WATFORD and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges, and FREUDENTHAL,**
District Judge.

Ruth Nunez-Campos petitions for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals

* 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).

*** The Honorable Nancy D. Freudenthal, United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming, sitting by designation.

order upholding the denial of her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Nunez-Campos failed to meet her burden for obtaining protection under CAT. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2). The immigration judge (IJ) denied relief under CAT because Nunez-Campos failed to establish that her husband "would even bother to contact her, much less torture her," or that the Mexican government would acquiesce in any torture. Before us, Nunez-Campos contends that the agency failed to consider all evidence of torture, namely country conditions reports indicating the prevalence of domestic violence against women in Mexico. But the IJ adequately considered and discussed the country conditions evidence, and the "circumstances of [Mexican] women in general . . . do not vitiate the agency's specific findings" as to Nunez-Campos in particular. *Dawson v. Garland*, 998 F.3d 876, 885 (9th Cir. 2021). Nunez-Campos does not challenge the IJ's finding that she failed to establish that her husband would torture her, and the record does not compel a contrary conclusion. The agency thus properly denied her request for relief under CAT.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.