

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1232

XUE QIANG LIN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 12-2080

XUE QIANG LIN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: March 1, 2013

Decided: April 4, 2013

Before NIEMEYER, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Adedayo O. Idowu, LAW OFFICES OF ADEDAYO O. IDOWU, PLLC, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Erica B. Miles, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jesse D. Lorenz, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated petitions for review, Xue Qiang Lin, a native and citizen of the People's Republic of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") orders (1) dismissing his appeal of the immigration judge's order denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (Appeal No. 12-1232), and (2) denying his motion to reopen removal proceedings (Appeal No. 12-2080). We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including Lin's affidavit, the various supporting affidavits and documents presented to the immigration court, and the transcript of Lin's merits hearing. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the Board's factual findings, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2006), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision to uphold the immigration judge's denial of Lin's application for relief. See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review in Appeal No. 12-1232 for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Xue Qiang Lin (B.I.A. Jan. 27, 2012).

We turn then to the Board's order denying Lin's motion to reopen his removal proceedings. We have reviewed the record as relevant to that motion and conclude that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying reopening in this case. See 8

C.F.R. § 1003.2(a), (c) (2012). We therefore deny the petition for review in Appeal No. 12-2080 for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Xue Qiang Lin (B.I.A. Aug. 7, 2012). 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.

PETITIONS DENIED