

United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eighth Circuit

---

No. 21-1222

---

Maura Elizabeth Lopez-Zamora

*Petitioner*

v.

Merrick B. Garland, Attorney General of the United States

*Respondent*

---

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

---

Submitted: June 22, 2022

Filed: June 27, 2022

[Unpublished]

---

Before ERICKSON, GRASZ, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Maura Elizabeth Lopez-Zamora, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA), which dismissed her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT) in withholding-only proceedings. See 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(5); 8 C.F.R.

§ 1208.2(c)(2)(i), (c)(3)(i) (2021). Lopez-Zamora argues the agency erred in denying her applications.

We conclude substantial evidence supports the denial of withholding of removal. See 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3)(A), (C) (eligibility requirements and burden of proof); Mendez-Gomez v. Barr, 928 F.3d 728, 733 (8th Cir. 2019) (standard of review). Even assuming either of the two particular social groups Lopez-Zamora proposed were cognizable, as the BIA did, substantial evidence supports the adverse nexus determination. See Silvestre-Giron v. Barr, 949 F.3d 1114, 1117-18, 1119 & n.3 (8th Cir. 2020). The agency reasonably determined the harm Lopez-Zamora suffered and feared was based on general crime by a drug-addicted actor who was personally motivated to harm her, and the record does not compel a contrary conclusion. See Chavez-Perez v. Garland, 860 Fed. Appx. 453, 456 (8th Cir. 2021) (per curiam); Salazar-Ortega v. Lynch, 654 Fed. Appx. 854, 855-57 (8th Cir. 2016) (per curiam). Because this determination independently disposed of Lopez-Zamora’s claim for withholding of removal, we do not reach her other arguments. See, e.g., De la Rosa v. Barr, 943 F.3d 1171, 1174-75 (8th Cir. 2019); Balhti v. Sessions, 878 F.3d 240, 245 (8th Cir. 2017) (per curiam).

We also conclude substantial evidence supports the denial of Lopez-Zamora’s CAT claim because she “presented no evidence supporting [her] application for CAT relief beyond what [s]he relied on for [her withholding-of-removal] claim.” Tojin-Tiu v. Garland, 33 F.4th 1020, 1024 (8th Cir. 2022); see also Fuentes-Erao v. Sessions, 848 F.3d 847, 853-54 (8th Cir. 2017). Finally, we decline to consider the arguments Lopez-Zamora raised for the first time in her reply brief. See Adame-Hernandez v. Barr, 929 F.3d 1020, 1023 n.1 (8th Cir. 2019) (arguments raised for first time in reply brief are waived).

The petition for review is denied. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.