

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 3 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

MARIA FERNANDA GARATE COELLO;
et al.,*

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-6280

Agency Nos.
A245-874-935
A245-874-937

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.

Maria Fernanda Garate Coello and her son, natives and citizens of Ecuador,
petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing

* The clerk will amend the caption to reflect lead petitioner's name as Maria Fernanda Garate Coello, consistent with the final removal order in the certified administrative record.

** 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).

their appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection 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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that petitioners failed to show they were or would be persecuted on account of a protected ground. *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (an applicant's "desire to be free from harassment by criminals motivated by theft or random violence by gang members bears no nexus to a protected ground"). Because petitioners failed to show any nexus to a protected ground, petitioners also failed to satisfy the standard for withholding of removal. *See Barajas-Romero v. Lynch*, 846 F.3d 351, 359-60 (9th Cir. 2017). 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 also 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 Ecuador. *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.