## **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MARVIN AMALIN DE LEON-VEGA,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 19-72411

Agency No. A072-116-010

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.

Marvin Amalin De Leon-Vega, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions

for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his

appeal from an immigration judge's 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).

## **FILED**

SEP 17 2021

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual findings, including determinations regarding social distinction. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241-42 (9th Cir. 2020). We review de novo the legal question of whether a particular social group is cognizable, except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA's interpretation of the governing statutes and regulations. *Id.* We review de novo claims of due process violations in immigration proceedings. *Jiang v. Holder*, 754 F.3d 733, 738 (9th Cir. 2014). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that De Leon-Vega failed to establish his proposed social groups are socially distinct. *See Conde Quevedo*, 947 F.3d at 1243 (substantial evidence supported the agency's determination that petitioner's proposed social group was not cognizable because of the absence of society-specific evidence of social distinction). Thus, the BIA did not err in concluding that De Leon-Vega did not establish membership in a cognizable particular social group. *See Reyes v. Lynch*, 842 F.3d 1125, 1131 (9th Cir. 2016) (in order to demonstrate membership in a particular social group, "[t]he applicant must 'establish that the group is (1) composed of members who share a common immutable characteristic, (2) defined with particularity, and (3) socially distinct within the society in question''' (quoting *Matter of M-E-V-G*-, 26 I. & N. Dec. 227, 237 (BIA 2014))).

2

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that De Leon-Vega did not otherwise establish nexus to 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 . . . bears no nexus to a protected ground").

Thus, De Leon-Vega's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because De Leon-Vega 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 Guatemala. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

We reject as unsupported by the record De Leon-Vega's contentions that the agency applied an incorrect standard, failed to consider evidence, or otherwise erred in its analysis of his claims. De Leon-Vega's contention that the BIA violated his right to due process also fails. *See Padilla-Martinez v. Holder*, 770 F.3d 825, 830 (9th Cir. 2014) ("To prevail on a due-process claim, a petitioner must demonstrate both a violation of rights and prejudice.").

De Leon-Vega's contentions that the immigration court lacked jurisdiction over his proceedings are foreclosed by *Aguilar Fermin v. Barr*, 958 F.3d 887, 895 (9th Cir. 2020) ("[T]he lack of time, date, and place in the NTA sent to [petitioner] did not deprive the immigration court of jurisdiction over her case.").

3

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

## PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.