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

No. 14-60448 Summary Calendar United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

**FILED** 

June 11, 2015

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

HUGO ALBERTO PEREZ, also known as Hugo Albert Moreno,

Petitioner

v.

LORETTA LYNCH, U. S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals BIA No. A201 064 108

\_\_\_\_

Before DAVIS, CLEMENT, and COSTA, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:\*

Hugo Alberto Perez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' dismissal of his appeal of the immigration judge's denial of his application for withholding of removal. Perez argues that the agency erred in denying his application for withholding of removal. He asserts that he established past persecution and a well-founded fear of future persecution based upon his membership in a particular social group, namely,

<sup>\*</sup> 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

No. 14-60448

people who have been threatened and harmed by gangs based on their refusal to join the gang. He further contends that Mexican authorities are unwilling or unable to protect him.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's denial of Perez's application for withholding of removal. We have previously rejected a similar argument that young men who were recruited by criminal gangs constitute a particular social group because the proposed group lacked the necessary social visibility and did not meet the particularity test. See Orellana-Monson v. Holder, 685 F.3d 511, 518 (5th Cir. 2012). Perez has not shown that his claim is distinguishable from that alleged in Orellana-Monson. Therefore, he has not shown that the evidence compels a conclusion that it is more likely than not that he will be persecuted on account of his membership in this particular social group if he is removed to Mexico. See Orellana-Monson, 685 F.3d at 518; Zhang v. Gonzales, 432 F.3d 339, 344 (5th Cir. 2005).

The petition for review is DENIED.