

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2488

MARIA DELMIS MARQUEZ GUEVARA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: August 31, 2016

Decided: September 22, 2016

Before DUNCAN, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Petition dismissed in part and denied in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John T. Riely, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Song Park, Senior Litigation Counsel, Surell Brady, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Maria Delmis Marquez Guevara, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing her appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of her requests for asylum and withholding of removal.*

Marquez Guevara challenges the finding that her asylum application is time-barred and that no exceptions were applicable. See 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(2)(B) (2012); 8 C.F.R. § 1208.4(a)(2) (2016). We lack jurisdiction to review this determination pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2012), and find that Marquez Guevara has not raised any claims that would fall under the exception set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) (2012). See Gomis v. Holder, 571 F.3d 353, 358-59 (4th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, we dismiss the petition for review with respect to the asylum claim.

To the extent Marquez Guevara challenges the Board's finding that she failed to establish eligibility for withholding of removal, we conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the agency's factual findings, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence

* Marquez Guevara does not raise any claims regarding the denial of protection under the Convention Against Torture.

supports the Board's decision, INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review in part for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re Marquez Guevara (B.I.A. Oct. 28, 2015). 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 DISMISSED IN PART
AND DENIED IN PART