

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

ARNOL JOSUE MARTINEZ CANALES,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-5263

Agency No.
A206-711-632

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.

Arnol Josue Martinez Canales, a native and citizen of Honduras, 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

* 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).

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 Martinez Canales failed to establish that the Honduran government was or would be unable or unwilling to control the gang members he fears. *See Truong v. Holder*, 613 F.3d 938, 941-42 (9th Cir. 2010) (record did not compel the conclusion that the government was unable or unwilling to control the individuals petitioner feared); *see also Canales-Vargas v. Gonzales*, 441 F.3d 739, 743 (9th Cir. 2006) (“The source of the persecution must be the government or forces that the government is unwilling or unable to control.”).

The BIA did not err by declining to reach Martinez Canales’ remaining contentions regarding his asylum and withholding of removal 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).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT protection because Martinez Canales 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 Honduras. *See Aden v. Holder*, 589 F.3d 1040, 1047 (9th Cir. 2009).

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.