

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

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 26, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 18-60576
Summary Calendar

KAREN GICELA MATUTE-CANALES; ANA SOFIA GALINDO-MATUTE,

Petitioners

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, U. S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petitions for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A206 623 956
BIA No. A206 623 957

Before REAVLEY, JONES, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Karen Gicela Matute-Canales and Ana Sofia Galindo-Matute, natives and citizens of Honduras, seek review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' (BIA) dismissal of their appeal of an immigration judge's (IJ) denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). Petitioners contend the BIA erred in finding that they had not

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-60576

demonstrated their eligibility for each of those forms of relief. Their requests for relief were based on their membership in the purported particular social group of people belonging to the family group of Edwin Alexy Galindo Garcia.

The BIA's findings of fact are reviewed for substantial evidence. *See Wang v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 531, 536 (5th Cir. 2009). "Under substantial evidence review, this court may not reverse the BIA's factual findings unless the evidence compels it." *Id.* at 536-37. Asylum may be granted to "an alien who is unable or unwilling to return to his home country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." *Zhang v. Gonzales*, 432 F.3d 339, 344 (5th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42)(A). In contrast, an applicant for withholding of removal must demonstrate "a clear probability" of persecution on account of one of those protected grounds upon return to her native country. *See Roy v. Ashcroft*, 389 F.3d 132, 138 (5th Cir. 2004). An applicant for CAT relief must establish that it is "more likely than not" that she would be tortured if removed to her home country by, or with the acquiescence of, government officials acting under the color of law. *See Hakim v. Holder*, 628 F.3d 151, 155 (5th Cir. 2010).

Evidence provided by petitioners, which included, *inter alia*, a 2015 country conditions report on Honduras and testimony from Matute-Canales and Galindo Garcia, does not compel a decision contrary to the agency's determination they did not qualify for asylum. *See Wang*, 569 F.3d at 536-37. Accordingly, they also did not meet the higher standard required for withholding of removal. *See Roy*, 389 F.3d at 138. Further, the evidence does not compel a decision contrary to the agency's determination that the

No. 18-60576

petitioners did not qualify for relief under the CAT. *See Hakim*, 628 F.3d at 155; *Wang*, 569 F.3d at 536-37.

Accordingly, the petitions for review are DENIED.