

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 28 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

GEINER YESICA RODRIGUEZ-  
MERIDA; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 24-2597

Agency Nos.  
A203-603-396  
A203-603-397

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 22, 2025\*\*

Before: GRABER, H.A. THOMAS, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Geiner Yesica Rodriguez-Merida and her minor daughter, natives and citizens of Guatemala, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order affirming without opinion an immigration judge's decision denying their applications for asylum and Rodriguez-Merida's applications for withholding

---

\* 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).

of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review the agency’s factual findings for substantial evidence. *Arrey v. Barr*, 916 F.3d 1149, 1157 (9th Cir. 2019). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that petitioners failed to show 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 Rodriguez-Merida failed to establish any nexus at all, she also failed to satisfy the standard for withholding of removal. *See Barajas-Romero v. Lynch*, 846 F.3d 351, 359-60 (9th Cir. 2017).

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).

Thus, petitioners’ asylum claim and Rodriguez-Merida’s withholding of removal claim fail.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s denial of CAT protection because Rodriguez-Merida 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 Guatemala. *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.**