NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

JUN 26 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SILVIA JAZMIN GRANDE-HERNANDEZ; A. J. C.-G.; A. J. C.-G., Petitioners, v. TODD BLANCHE, Acting Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 25-3395 Agency Nos. A212-905-364 A212-905-363 A212-905-365 MEMORANDUM[*]

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

Submitted June 24, 2026[**]
San Francisco, California

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

Silvia Jazmin Grande-Hernandez and her two minor children are natives and citizens of El Salvador. They petition for review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") affirming a decision of an Immigration Judge ("IJ,"

[*] 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).

and, together with the BIA, "the Agency") denying their applications for asylum and withholding of removal.[1] We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny the petition.

"Where, as here, the BIA agrees with and incorporates specific findings of the IJ while adding its own reasoning, we review both decisions." *Bhattarai v. Lynch*, 835 F.3d 1037, 1042 (9th Cir. 2016). We review legal questions de novo and the Agency's factual findings for substantial evidence. *Perez-Portillo v. Garland*, 56 F.4th 788, 792 (9th Cir. 2022). Substantial evidence is a "'highly deferential'" standard under which "we must accept the BIA's factual findings as 'conclusive unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to conclude to the contrary.'" *Salguero Sosa v. Garland*, 55 F.4th 1213, 1217–18 (9th Cir. 2022) (quoting *Nasrallah v. Barr*, 590 U.S. 573, 583–84 (2020); 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B)).

Substantial evidence supports the Agency's conclusion that Grande-Hernandez failed to establish that "the Salvadoran government was or will be 'unable or unwilling' to control the private individual she fears[.]" *See Corpeno-Romero v. Garland*, 120 F.4th 570, 577 (9th Cir. 2024) ("To qualify for asylum or withholding of removal based on a claim of past persecution, [petitioners] must

[1] Grande-Hernandez's two minor children are derivative beneficiaries of her asylum application but not her withholding of removal application. *See Sumolang v. Holder*, 723 F.3d 1080, 1083 (9th Cir. 2013).

show that . . . the persecution was committed by the government or by forces that the government was unable or unwilling to control."). The Salvadoran government arrested, convicted, and imprisoned Grande-Hernandez's ex-partner, Sergio, for homicide. Grande-Hernandez never reported to the police the abuse she endured before Sergio was arrested, or to prison officials the abuse she endured while Sergio was in prison. The record also includes evidence that the Salvadoran government has mounted operations against gangs and has pursued efforts to address domestic abuse. Grande-Hernandez fails to point to any evidence that would compel a conclusion contrary to that which the Agency reached.

PETITION DENIED.[2]

[2] The temporary stay of removal (Dkt. No. 3) remains in place until the mandate issues.