

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 21 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CATARINA SEBASTIAN  
MIGUEL; SINDI ENCARNACION  
MATEO SEBASTIAN; YENIFER ISABEL  
MATEO SEBASTIAN,

Petitioners,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 23-1332

Agency Nos.  
A206-843-626  
A206-843-627  
A206-843-628

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 19, 2025\*\*  
Pasadena, California

Before: PAEZ, TALLMAN, and R. NELSON, Circuit Judges.

Catarina Sebastian Miguel and her daughters, natives and citizens of  
Guatemala, petition for review of a decision by the Board of Immigration Appeals

---

\* 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).

(BIA) dismissing their appeal from an order of an Immigration Judge (IJ) denying their applications for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252, and we deny the petition.

“In cases in which, as here, the BIA adopts and affirms the decision of the IJ but also adds its own analysis, the scope of our review extends to the decisions of both the IJ and the BIA.” *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009) (cleaned up). “We review the agency’s legal determinations de novo, and factual findings for substantial evidence.” *Id.*

Sebastian Miguel’s asylum and withholding claims fail because she has not shown that the record compels the conclusion that a protected ground would be “at least one central reason” or even “a reason” for the harm she fears in Guatemala. *See Garcia v. Wilkinson*, 988 F.3d 1136, 1146 (9th Cir. 2021). Sebastian Miguel testified that she did not know what motivated the murders of her sister-in-law and others in her village, and the record otherwise lacks any compelling evidence of the murderers’ motives. Thus, substantial evidence supports the agency’s dispositive determination that Sebastian Miguel did not establish a nexus to a protected ground. *See id.* at 1144; 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101(a)(42)(A), 1158(b)(1)(A)–(B), 1231(b)(3)(A).

**PETITION DENIED.**