

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 25 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

RAJDEEP SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-3175

Agency No.
A203-677-606

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted September 22, 2026**

Before: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Rajdeep Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have

* 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).

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 Singh failed to show he was or would be persecuted on account of a protected ground. *See Pagayon v. Holder*, 675 F.3d 1182, 1191 (9th Cir. 2011) (a personal dispute, standing alone, does not constitute persecution on account of a protected ground). Because Singh failed to show any nexus to a protected ground, he 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, Singh's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail.

We do not address Singh's contentions as to the cognizability of his particular social group and his well-founded fear of future persecution because the BIA did not deny relief on these grounds. *See Santiago-Rodriguez v. Holder*, 657 F.3d 820, 829 (9th Cir. 2011) ("In reviewing the decision of the BIA, we consider only the grounds relied upon by that agency." (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The BIA did not err in finding Singh ineligible for humanitarian asylum because he did not establish that he suffered past persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Belishta v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 1078, 1080 (9th Cir. 2004)

(explaining that humanitarian asylum requires a showing of past persecution).

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT protection because Singh failed to show it is more likely than not he will be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to India. *See Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1067-68 (9th Cir. 2009) (no likelihood of torture).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.