

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 25 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JOSE LUIS ROMERO AVILA; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 24-5087

Agency Nos.

A215-880-734

A215-880-735

A215-880-736

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 15, 2025**

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

Jose Luis Romero Avila and his family, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order affirming without opinion an immigration judge's decision denying their application for asylum, and Romero Avila's applications for 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 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 show any nexus to a protected ground, Romero Avila 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).

Romero Avila does not challenge the agency’s determination that he did not establish eligibility for protection under the CAT, so we do not address it. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013).

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.