

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1855

JOSEPHINE MBETE NGUMBI,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: June 8, 2015

Decided: June 12, 2015

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randall L. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C., Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Ernesto H. Molina, Jr., Assistant Director, Tracey N. McDonald, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Josephine Mbeti Ngumbi, a native and citizen of Kenya, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's order denying her application for asylum.* We deny the petition for review.

We review factual findings for substantial evidence. Hernandez-Avalos v. Lynch, 784 F.3d 944, 948 (4th Cir. 2015). Such findings are conclusive "unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to conclude to the contrary." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). We will uphold the Board's decision "unless it is manifestly contrary to law and an abuse of discretion." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). We have reviewed the record, including Ngumbi's testimony and the documentary evidence, and conclude that substantial evidence supports the finding that Ngumbi failed to establish a nexus between her past harm or her fear of future harm on account of a protected ground. Accordingly, the record does not compel a different result.

* The immigration judge also denied Ngumbi's applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture. Ngumbi has abandoned review of those decisions by failing to challenge those decisions in her brief. Karimi v. Holder, 715 F.3d 561, 565 n.2 (4th Cir. 2013).

We deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED