

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 17-14998

---

Agency No. A209-230-480

SUKIRTHAN SINNARTHURI,

Petitioner,

versus

U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

---

Petition for Review of a Decision of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

---

(August 8, 2019)

Before WILSON and NEWSOM, Circuit Judges, and COOGLER,\* District Judge.

PER CURIAM:

---

\* Honorable L. Scott Coogler, District Judge for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, sitting by designation.

The Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) affirmed the denial of Sukirthan Sinnarthuri's application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). Sinnarthuri petitioned for review. While that petition was pending in this Court, the BIA granted Sinnarthuri's motion to reopen his immigration proceedings based on new evidence. The government then filed a motion to dismiss this appeal for lack of jurisdiction. While that motion was pending, an Immigration Judge (IJ) in the reopened proceedings granted Sinnarthuri's petition for asylum under 8 U.S.C. § 1158. Sinnarthuri was subsequently released from detention.

“If events that occur subsequent to the filing of a lawsuit or an appeal deprive the court of the ability to give the plaintiff or appellant meaningful relief, then the case is moot and must be dismissed.” *Al Najjar v. Ashcroft*, 273 F.3d 1330, 1336 (11th Cir. 2001). Because the IJ in the reopened proceedings granted Sinnarthuri the precise relief he sought—asylum—this case “no longer presents a live controversy” over which we may exercise jurisdiction. *Id.* Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

**DISMISSED.**