

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 16-3496

Jose Domingo Hernand Santos

Petitioner

v.

Jefferson B. Sessions, III,¹ Attorney General of the United States

Respondent

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

Submitted: July 20, 2017

Filed: July 28, 2017

[Unpublished]

Before GRUENDER, BOWMAN, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Guatemalan citizen Jose Domingo Hernand Santos petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing his appeal from the

¹Jefferson B. Sessions, III, is substituted for his predecessor under Rule 43(c)(2) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

decision of an immigration judge (IJ) who denied him asylum, withholding of removal, relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT), cancellation of removal, and special-rule cancellation under the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act of 1997 (NACARA). Santos argues that (1) he qualified for at least one of the foregoing forms of relief, (2) the BIA erred by failing to detail its own rationale for denying relief after adopting the IJ's reasoning, (3) he is entitled to cancellation of removal because his removal will present an exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to his United States citizen daughter, and (4) he is entitled to NACARA relief.

To begin, we conclude that the BIA sufficiently and adequately explained its decision. As to the denial of relief, Santos has not raised a viable legal or constitutional challenge to the discretionary denial of cancellation based on hardship to a qualifying relative. Further, his challenge to the denial of NACARA relief is based on the unreviewable factual determination that Santos failed to register in a timely manner for NACARA benefits. Finally, Santos waived his appeal of the agency's asylum, withholding, and CAT determinations by failing to meaningfully challenge them in his brief. See Chay-Velasquez v. Ashcroft, 367 F.3d 751, 756 (8th Cir. 2004).²

The petition for review is denied.

²In any event, we conclude that substantial evidence supports the denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and CAT relief.