

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

OCT 24 2007

HUSSAIN BUX BROHI; AMAL  
HUSSAIN; FARIDA HUSSAIN;  
GHULAM HUSSAIN,

Petitioners,

v.

PETER D. KEISLER,\*\* Acting Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-73867

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Agency Nos. A79-594-526

A79-594-727

A79-594-728

A79-594-729

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted October 19, 2007\*\*\*  
San Francisco, California

Before: BEEZER, TROTT, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* Peter D. Keisler is substituted for his predecessor, Alberto R. Gonzales, as Acting Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 43(c)(2).

\*\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Lead Petitioner Hussain Bux Brohi, his wife, Farida Hussain, and minor children Amal Hussain and Ghulam Hussain, who are citizens of Pakistan, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' decision summarily affirming an immigration judge's ("IJ") denial of their applications for asylum and withholding of removal and their request for relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We review for substantial evidence, Bhasin v. Gonzales, 423 F.3d 977, 983 (9th Cir. 2005), and deny the petition.

1. Substantial evidence supports the IJ's conclusion that Petitioners are ineligible for asylum because they did not establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of a protected ground. 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42). The police in this case accused lead Petitioner of helping his brother, but the record does not compel a conclusion that they imputed any political views or opinions to lead Petitioner himself.

2. Because Petitioners failed to establish eligibility for asylum, they necessarily failed to meet the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. See Fedunyak v. Gonzales, 477 F.3d 1126, 1130 (9th Cir. 2007).

3. Petitioners also failed to establish a CAT claim because they did not show that it was more likely than not that they would be tortured if they returned to Pakistan. Zhou v. Gonzales, 437 F.3d 860, 871 (9th Cir. 2006).

Petition for review DENIED.

