

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

YVROSE ARESTIL,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-6263

Agency No.
A209-869-922

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.

Yvrose Arestil, a native and citizen of Haiti, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying her 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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s conclusion that Arestil failed to show she 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); *Nagoulko v. INS*, 333 F.3d 1012, 1016 (9th Cir. 2003) (record did not compel the conclusion that ridicule, discrimination, and loss of economic opportunity rose to the level of persecution).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency’s conclusion that Arestil failed to show a reasonable possibility of future persecution. *See Nagoulko*, 333 F.3d at 1018 (possibility of future persecution was “too speculative”). Arestil’s asylum claim thus fails.

Because Arestil failed to show eligibility for asylum, she failed to satisfy the standard for withholding of removal. *See Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1190 (9th Cir. 2006).

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s denial of CAT protection because Arestil failed to show it is more likely than not she will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to Haiti. *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.