

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

October 19, 2010

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 09-60810

Summary Calendar  
\_\_\_\_\_

BERLY MARITZA RAMOS,

Petitioner

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals  
BIA No. A095 908 099  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before REAVLEY, DENNIS, and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Berly Ramos petitions for review of the determination by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) that she is not entitled to withholding of removal. Ramos contends that she is entitled to withholding of removal because of past persecution and the likelihood of future persecution on account of her membership in a particular social group, namely Students for Health (SFH), which she contends incurred the enmity of gangs because the group encouraged citizens to report criminal activity.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

To establish eligibility for withholding of removal, Ramos must show that it is more likely than not her life or freedom would be threatened by persecution on account of one of five protected categories, including membership in a particular social group. *Efe v. Ashcroft*, 293 F.3d 899, 906 (5th Cir. 2002). We review the BIA's determination for substantial evidence; we will not reverse unless the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. *Id.* at 905-06.

Ramos's arguments amount primarily to a claim that she has suffered gang violence as a result of her activities with SFH, but there was little to no evidence that membership in SFH is an immutable characteristic qualifying it as a particular social group, or that she would continue to face persecution now that she no longer belongs to SFH. *See Majd v. Gonzales*, 446 F.3d 590, 595 (5th Cir. 2006); *Mwembie v. Gonzales*, 443 F.3d 405, 414-15 (5th Cir. 2006). We cannot say that the record compels the conclusion that she established eligibility for withholding of removal.

The petition for review is DENIED.