

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 1 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

PEDRO SANTIAGO-FRUCTUOZO,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 25-3022

Agency No.
A200-244-028

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted May 26, 2026**

Before: S.R. THOMAS, MILLER, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Pedro Santiago-Fructuozo, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture

* 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).

(“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.

We do not address Santiago-Fructuozo’s contentions as to the one-year filing deadline for his asylum application because the BIA did not deny relief on that ground. *See Santiago-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 657 F.3d 820, 829 (9th Cir. 2011) (“In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Santiago-Fructuozo 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 Santiago-Fructuozo 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, Santiago-Fructuozo’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach Santiago-Fructuozo’s remaining contentions regarding the cognizability of his proposed particular social group. *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).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT protection because Santiago-Fructuozo failed to show it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Mexico. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

The motion to stay removal is denied.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.