

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 23 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

WIDMANT ALBERTO CHAMALE
HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 23-4438

Agency No.
A220-148-884

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted September 17, 2025**

Before: SILVERMAN, OWENS, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Widmant Alberto Chamale Hernandez, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the

* 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).

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 review de novo questions of law. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Chamale Hernandez failed to show he was 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 Chamale Hernandez failed to show any nexus to a protected ground, he 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, Chamale Hernandez’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach Chamale Hernandez’s remaining contentions regarding the merits of his 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).

The BIA did not err in its conclusion that Chamale Hernandez waived any challenge to the IJ’s denial of his CAT claim. *See Alanniz v. Barr*, 924 F.3d 1061,

1068-69 (9th Cir. 2019) (no error in BIA's waiver determination).

To the extent Chamale Hernandez contends the agency failed to fully consider all of the evidence, we reject this contention as unsupported by the record.

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.