**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

FILED

OCT 28 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

| | |
|---|---|
| MARIA FILOMENA MARTINEZ CARTAGENA; N.A.C.M.,<br><br>Petitioners,<br><br>v.<br><br>TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,<br><br>Respondent. | No. 21-70503<br><br>Agency Nos.<br><br>A208-601-968<br>A208-601-969<br><br>MEMORANDUM* |

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

Submitted October 26, 2026**
Pasadena, California

Before: R. NELSON and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges, and MARTÍNEZ-OLGUÍN, District Judge.***

Maria Filomena Martinez Cartagena and her minor child are natives and citizens of El Salvador. They petition for review of a decision of the Board of

* 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).

*** The Honorable Araceli Martínez-Olguín, United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, sitting by designation.

Immigration Appeals ("BIA") dismissing an appeal from an order by an Immigration Judge ("IJ") (collectively, the "Agency") denying Cartagena's applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").[1] We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We deny the petition.

Where the BIA adopts the decision of the IJ, citing *Matter of Burbano*, 20 I. & N. Dec. 872 (BIA 1994), and adds its own reasoning, we review both decisions. *Posos-Sanchez v. Garland*, 3 F.4th 1176, 1182 (9th Cir. 2021). We review the BIA's legal conclusions de novo, and we "review the BIA's factual determinations for substantial evidence, meaning we may reverse only if the evidence compels a conclusion contrary to the BIA's." *Umana-Escobar v. Garland*, 69 F.4th 544, 550 (9th Cir. 2023).[2]

1. Substantial evidence supports the Agency's denial of Cartagena's asylum and withholding of removal claims. Cartagena fails to point to evidence in the record that compels reversal of the Agency's determination that she failed to

[1] Cartagena's minor child is a derivative beneficiary of her asylum application. The minor child did not file separate applications for withholding of removal and CAT protection.

[2] Cartagena argues that we must review the Agency's conclusions de novo because the BIA issued a streamlined decision. But the BIA did not issue a streamlined affirmance. *See Abebe v. Gonzales*, 432 F.3d 1037, 1040 n.3 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc) (clarifying that the BIA's affirmance citing *Matter of Burbano* differs from a streamlined affirmance).

establish a nexus between any past harm or future fear of harm and her proposed particular social group, "Salvadoran women who have suffered threats and extortion by the gangs." *See Zetino v. Holder*, 622 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2010) (holding that 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"). The record supports the Agency's conclusion that the gang members were solely motivated to threaten Cartagena's partner due to their desire to obtain money. Cartagena testified that the written notes her partner received threatened harm only if her partner did not pay the requested money. And on appeal, Cartagena concedes that the gang members issued the threats because they were "demanding money."

2. Cartagena does not meaningfully dispute the Agency's CAT protection determination. She has therefore forfeited this issue. *See Hernandez v. Garland*, 47 F.4th 908, 916 (9th Cir. 2022) (holding that arguments not argued "specifically and distinctly" in an opening brief are deemed forfeited (citation modified)).

**PETITION DENIED.**[3]

[3] Cartagena's motion to stay removal, Dkt. No. 1, is denied. The temporary stay of removal is lifted.