

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUN 24 2022

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

SABPREET SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-71306

Agency No. A205-937-152

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 15, 2022**

Before: SILVERMAN, WATFORD, and FORREST, Circuit Judges.

Sabpreet Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' 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"). We have

* 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).

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 Singh failed to establish the harm he experienced or fears in India 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"); *see also Pagayon v. Holder*, 675 F.3d 1182, 1191 (9th Cir. 2011) (a personal dispute, standing alone, does not constitute persecution on account of a protected ground). Thus, his asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Singh 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 India. *See Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1067-68 (9th Cir. 2009) (no likelihood of torture).

We reject as unsupported by the record Singh's contention that the agency failed to consider evidence or otherwise erred in the analysis of his claims.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.