

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-1293

JOSE MATEO GONZALEZ-ALVAREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: November 19, 2020

Decided: December 1, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, RICHARDSON, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Perham Makabi, Kew Gardens, New York, for Petitioner. Ethan P. Davis, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Holly M. Smith, Senior Litigation Counsel, David J. Schor, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jose Mateo Gonzalez-Alvarez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal of the Immigration Judge's (IJ) decision denying relief from removal. Gonzalez-Alvarez raises a single issue on appeal, asserting that the Board erred in declining to address his claim, raised for the first time in his administrative appeal, that he qualified for asylum based on imputed anti-gang political opinion. Upon review, we conclude that Gonzalez-Alvarez's administrative appeal brief did not meet the requirements of a motion to reconsider or remand, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1), (c)(1) (2020), and that the Board did not err in declining to consider his claim based on anti-gang political opinion for the first time on appeal. *See Matter of W-Y-C-*, 27 I. & N. Dec. 189, 190 (B.I.A. 2018) (noting that Board has long held that it will generally not consider arguments or claims that could have, but were not, raised before the IJ). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. *See In re Gonzalez-Alvarez* (B.I.A. Feb. 11, 2020). 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