

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 27 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BLANCA ESTELA CHICAS-DE
QUINTANILLA, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 19-72738

Agency Nos. A208-380-927
A208-380-928

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 17, 2022**

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

Blanca Estela Chicas-De Quintanilla and her minor daughter, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision

* 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).

denying their application for asylum and denying Chicas-De Quintanilla's application for withholding of removal and protection under the 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 conclusion that Petitioners failed to establish that they would be persecuted on account of 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 by gang members bears no nexus to a protected ground"). Thus, Petitioners' asylum claim and Chicas-De Quintanilla's withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of CAT protection because Chicas-De Quintanilla failed to show it is more likely than not she will 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.