

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

JASMIN SUYAPA PALACIOS
MARTINEZ; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 25-5374

Agency Nos.
A201-686-419
A206-686-420

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.

Jasmin Suyapa Palacios Martinez and her minor son, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing their appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying their application for asylum and Palacios Martinez's applications for withholding

* 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).

of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny the petition for review.

Petitioners do not challenge the BIA’s conclusion that they waived review of the IJ’s dispositive determinations that the harm petitioners suffered did not rise to the level of persecution and that they did not demonstrate an objectively reasonable fear of future persecution, so we do not address these issues. *See Lopez-Vasquez v. Holder*, 706 F.3d 1072, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2013). Palacios Martinez also does not challenge the BIA’s conclusion that she waived review of the IJ’s denial of CAT protection. *See id.* Thus, petitioners’ asylum claim, and Palacio Martinez’s withholding of removal and CAT claims fail.

In light of this disposition, we need not reach petitioners’ contentions regarding the merits of their claims. *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 motion to stay removal is denied as moot.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.