

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 27 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CARMEN JULISSA LOVO-IRAHETA; et
al,

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-4602

Agency Nos.

A203-576-592

A203-576-593

A203-576-594

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 25, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, N.R. SMITH, and DE ALBA, Circuit Judges.

Carmen Julissa Lovo-Iraheta and her minor children, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying their 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 deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that petitioners failed to show they suffered harm that rose to the level of persecution. *See Urias-Orellana v. Bondi*, 607 U.S. 537, 545 (2026) (the agency’s persecution determination is reviewed for substantial evidence); *Duran-Rodriguez v. Barr*, 918 F.3d 11025, 1028-29 (9th Cir. 2019) (record did not compel the conclusion that threats rose to the level of persecution).

Petitioners do not challenge the agency’s determination that they failed to establish that the government of El Salvador would be unable or unwilling to protect them, so we do not address it. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013).

Petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims thus fail.

We do not address petitioners’ contentions as to nexus or a cognizable particular social group because the BIA did not deny relief on these grounds. *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 denial of CAT protection because petitioners failed to show it is more likely than not they will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to El Salvador. *See Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1033 (9th Cir. 2014) ("torture must be 'inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity'" (internal citation omitted)).

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.