

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 1 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CLAUDIA LISSETH VALENZUELA-
FRANCO; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-5635

Agency Nos.

A215-709-324

A215-709-325

A215-709-326

A215-709-327

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.

Claudia Lisseth Valenzuela-Franco and her children, natives and citizens of El Salvador, 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 dispositive determination that they failed to demonstrate that the government of El Salvador was or would be unable or unwilling to protect them. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013). Thus, their asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach petitioners’ remaining contentions regarding the merits of their 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 El Salvador. *See Garcia-Milian v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 1026, 1033 (9th Cir. 2014) (“[T]orture 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.