

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

DOMENIS GUADALUPE PAZMINO
LOOR; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

Nos. 25-6496

Agency Nos.
A245-973-385
A245-973-388
A245-973-390

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.

Domenis Pazmino Loor, Wilinton Karofiles Rojas, and their child, natives and citizens of Ecuador, 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

* 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).

protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo constitutional claims. *Mohammed v. Gonzales*, 400 F.3d 785, 791-92 (9th Cir. 2005). 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 Ecuador 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).

Petitioners do not challenge the BIA’s conclusion that they waived review of the IJ’s denial of CAT protection. *See Lopez-Vasquez*, 706 F.3d at 1079-80.

Petitioners’ claim that the BIA violated due process by issuing a conclusory decision fails because petitioners have not shown error. *See Padilla-Martinez v. Holder*, 770 F.3d 825, 830 (9th Cir. 2014) (“To prevail on a due-process claim, a petitioner must demonstrate both a violation of rights and prejudice.”).

The motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.