NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

OCT 30 2026

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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MAURICIO ALEXANDER LEZAMA ARCE I; MARY LUZ TORREZ I; G. A. L. T. I; L. S. L. T. I; K. S. L. T. I, Petitioners, v. TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General, Respondent.	No. 25-6094 Agency Nos. A220-598-903 A216-637-687 A216-637-688 A216-637-689 A216-637-690 MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 28, 2026**
Pasadena, California

Before: WARDLAW, R. NELSON, and H.A. THOMAS, Circuit Judges
.

Petitioners, a family of five natives and citizens of Nicaragua, petition for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") decision dismissing their appeal from an Immigration Judge's ("IJ") order denying their applications for asylum,

* 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).

withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). Reviewing the BIA's legal conclusions de novo and factual findings for substantial evidence, *Abebe v. Gonzales*, 432 F.3d 1037, 1039–40 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc), we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's determination, affirmed by the BIA, that Petitioners failed to show either past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution, thus making them ineligible for asylum. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(1)(B)(i); *Hussain v. Rosen*, 985 F.3d 634, 645–46 (9th Cir. 2021). As Petitioners had conceded to the IJ that they had not faced previous persecution, the BIA properly focused its analysis on Petitioners' arguments supporting their claim that they have a well-founded fear of future persecution.

As to Petitioners' alleged claims of a fear of future persecution, the BIA affirmed the IJ's findings that Petitioners (1) were not previously physically harmed, (2) faced the mere prospect of a lost opportunity to buy land, (3) provided insufficient evidence that the Nicaraguan government remained interested in targeting them, and (4) had several family members who remained unharmed in the country. These adopted findings constitute substantial evidence that Petitioners do not possess a well-founded fear of future persecution. *See Sharma v. Garland*, 9 F.4th 1052, 1061 (9th Cir. 2021) ("We have repeatedly denied petitions for review when, among other factors, the record did not demonstrate significant physical

harm."); *Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1022 (9th Cir. 2006) (petitioner failed to demonstrate an objective well-founded fear of persecution because he did not present any evidence of further issues with the government); *Tamang v. Holder*, 598 F.3d 1083, 1094–95 (9th Cir. 2010) (no objective fear of future persecution when similarly situated family members remained unharmed in home country). Though Petitioners argue that they are likely to suffer economic deprivation upon their return to Nicaragua, the BIA permissibly found that evidence relating to the loss of the land sale fell short of persecution when assessed together with the record. *See Hussain*, 985 F.3d at 647 ("Mere economic disadvantage alone does not rise to the level of persecution." (cleaned up)).

Because Petitioners do not meet the standard for asylum, the BIA was correct in finding that they do not meet the more stringent standards of clear probability for withholding of removal and likelihood of future torture under CAT. *See Mansour v. Ashcroft*, 390 F.3d 667, 673 (9th Cir. 2004); *Sharma*, 9 F.4th at 1066–67.

PETITION DENIED.[1]

[1] Petitioners' motion to stay removal, Dkt. No. 8, is denied. The temporary stay of removal is lifted.