

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-1794**

---

SEAN BYRD GLOD,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: February 18, 2014

Decided: March 21, 2014

---

Before DIAZ, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ronald D. Richey, LAW OFFICE OF RONALD D. RICHEY, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, Leslie McKay, Assistant Director, Melissa K. Lott, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Sean Byrd Glod, a native of Venezuela and a citizen of Trinidad and Tobago, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of his request for deferral of removal under the Convention Against Torture. For the reasons discussed below, we dismiss the petition for review.

Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(C), we lack jurisdiction, except as provided in 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D), to review the final order of removal of an alien who is removable for having been convicted of certain enumerated offenses, including an aggravated felony. Under § 1252(a)(2)(C), we retain jurisdiction "to review factual determinations that trigger the jurisdiction-stripping provision, such as whether [Glod i]s an alien and whether [h]e has been convicted of an aggravated felony." Ramtulla v. Ashcroft, 301 F.3d 202, 203 (4th Cir. 2002). Once we confirm these two factual determinations, we may only consider "constitutional claims or questions of law." § 1252(a)(2)(D); see also Turkson v. Holder, 667 F.3d 523, 527 (4th Cir. 2012).

Because Glod has conceded that he is an alien and that he has been convicted of an aggravated felony, we find that § 1252(a)(2)(C) divests us of jurisdiction over the petition for review. We have reviewed his claims on appeal and find that he

raises no colorable questions of law or constitutional claims. Accordingly, we dismiss the petition for review. 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