

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 26 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

ALEJANDRA ANDRES-CRISTOBAL DE
RAMON; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 24-162

Agency Nos.
A220-150-893
A220-150-894

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 18, 2025**

Before: CANBY, S.R. THOMAS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Alejandra Andres-Cristobal De Ramon and her minor daughter, natives and citizens of Guatemala, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and

* 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).

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. *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* their proposed gender-based particular social groups. *See Ayala v. Holder*, 640 F.3d 1095, 1097 (9th Cir. 2011) (an applicant must show that “persecution was or will be on account of his membership in such group”) (emphasis in original).

Petitioners do not challenge the BIA’s conclusion that they waived review of the IJ’s determinations that they failed to establish a nexus to their indigenous and family-based particular social groups or political opinion, so we do not address these issues. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013).

Because petitioners failed to show any nexus to a protected ground, 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.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s 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 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.