

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 31 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

FREDY SALVADOR LACAN-LOPEZ; et  
al.,

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-1627

Agency Nos.

A201-569-699

A201-569-700

A201-914-801

A201-914-802

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.

Fredy Salvador Lacan-Lopez and his family, natives and citizens of  
Guatemala, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’  
 (“BIA”) order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision  
denying their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection

---

\* 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).

under the 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.

Petitioners do not challenge the BIA’s conclusion that they waived review of the IJ’s determination that petitioners failed to show they were or would be persecuted on account of a protected ground, so we do not address it. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013). Thus, petitioners’ asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach petitioners’ remaining contentions regarding the merits of their 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 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 Guatemala. *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.**