

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 2 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

SORIN FLORIN STAICU; DARIA  
FLORENTI STAICU; MARIA MIRELA  
STAICU,

Petitioners,

v.

PAMELA BONDI, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-2328

Agency Nos.  
A240-594-008  
A240-594-006  
A240-594-007

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted December 2, 2025\*\*  
San Francisco, California

Before: R. NELSON, COLLINS, and VANDYKE, Circuit Judges.

Petitioner Sorin Florin Staicu (“Staicu”) seeks review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’s affirmance of an Immigration Judge’s denial of Staicu’s

---

\* 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).

application for asylum, withholding of removal, and Convention Against Torture relief.<sup>1</sup> We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252 and deny the petition.

Staicu’s single brief in this court merely recites legal standards and contains no analysis or argument challenging the agency’s findings in this case. Because the only case-specific contentions in Staicu’s brief are “purely conclusory and devoid of supporting factual detail or legal argument,” we deem any challenge to the agency’s findings and final order of removal to have been forfeited. *Olea-Serefina v. Garland*, 34 F.4th 856, 867 (9th Cir. 2022).

**PETITION DENIED.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Staicu’s wife and minor child did not file separate applications for relief and were instead listed as derivative beneficiaries on Staicu’s application for asylum. *See Ali v. Ashcroft*, 394 F.3d 780, 782 n.1 (9th Cir. 2005) (stating that, unlike asylum, withholding of removal and relief under the Convention Against Torture “may not be derivative”).