

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

CLAUDIO MARTINS,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 24-6579

Agency No.
A059-389-130

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of
an Immigration Judge

Submitted June 18, 2025**

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

Claudio Martins, a native and citizen of Brazil, petitions pro se for review of an immigration judge's ("IJ") order affirming an asylum officer's negative reasonable fear determination. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the IJ's affirmance of the negative reasonable fear

* 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).

determination. *Orozco-Lopez v. Garland*, 11 F.4th 764, 774 (9th Cir. 2021). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's determination that Martins failed to show a reasonable possibility that the harm he suffered or fears was or would be on account of a protected ground. *See Bartolome v. Sessions*, 904 F.3d 803, 814 (9th Cir. 2018) (no basis for withholding of removal where petitioner did not show a nexus to a protected ground).

Substantial evidence also supports the IJ's determination that Martins failed to show a reasonable possibility of torture by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Brazil. *See Andrade-Garcia v. Lynch*, 828 F.3d 829, 836-37 (9th Cir. 2016) (petitioner failed to demonstrate government acquiescence sufficient to establish a reasonable possibility of future torture)

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.