

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 24 2024

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

DILCIA MARINA VASQUEZ-  
LOZANO; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 23-2375

Agency Nos.

A209-231-814

A209-231-815

A209-231-816

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted December 17, 2024\*\*

Before: WALLACE, GRABER, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Dilcia Marina Vasquez-Lozano and her children (“Petitioners”), natives and citizens of Honduras, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s 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 applications for asylum, 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 factual findings. *Conde Quevedo v. Barr*, 947 F.3d 1238, 1241 (9th Cir. 2020). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the determination that petitioners failed to establish they were or 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”). Because petitioners failed to establish any nexus at all, they also failed to satisfy the standard for withholding of removal. *See Barajas-Romero v. Lynch*, 846 F.3d 351, 359-60 (9th Cir. 2017). Thus, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach petitioners’ remaining contentions regarding the merits of their claims. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts and agencies are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

Substantial evidence also supports the denial of CAT protection because petitioners failed to show it is more likely than not they will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Honduras. *See Aden*

*v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

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

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**