

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

NOV 15 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DELFINO JACOBO GOMEZ-
GONZALEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 20-72494

Agency No. A202-054-251

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 8, 2021**

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA, and MILLER, Circuit Judges.

Delfino Jacobo Gomez-Gonzalez, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his request for a continuance and his application 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 abuse of discretion the denial of a continuance and review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings. *Ahmed v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 1009, 1012 (9th Cir. 2009). We deny the petition for review.

The agency did not abuse its discretion in denying Gomez-Gonzalez’s request for a continuance where he did not demonstrate good cause. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.29; *Ahmed*, 569 F.3d at 1012 (listing factors to be considered in determining whether the denial of a continuance constitutes an abuse of discretion).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Gomez-Gonzalez failed to establish the harm he experienced or fears 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, Gomez-Gonzalez’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT relief because Gomez-Gonzalez failed to show it is more likely than not he will 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).

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.