

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 16 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOSE ALFREDO CANAS-COREAS;
SOFIA MELANY CANAS-COREAS,

Petitioners,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 20-71103

Agency Nos. A208-538-261
A208-538-267

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 14, 2021**

Before: PAEZ, NGUYEN, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Jose Alfredo Canas-Coreas and Sofia Melany Canas-Coreas, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the

* 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).

Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). 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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that petitioners failed to establish the harm they experienced or fear was or would be on account of a protected ground. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992) (an applicant “must provide *some* evidence of [motive], direct or circumstantial”); *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, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

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

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.