

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2458

NORMA MURILLO-ZUNIGA; K.S.A.,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: June 9, 2014

Decided: July 14, 2014

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ivan Yacub, Tamara Jezic, YACUB LAW OFFICES, Falls Church, Virginia, for Petitioners. Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, Daniel E. Goldman, Senior Litigation Counsel, Mona Maria Yousif, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Norma Murillo-Zuniga and her son, natives and citizens of Honduras, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge's denial of Murillo-Zuniga's requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.* We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Murillo-Zuniga's merits hearing, her application for relief, and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative factual findings, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision. See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Murillo-Zuniga (B.I.A. Nov. 6, 2013). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

* The Petitioners have failed to raise any challenges to the denial of Murillo-Zuniga's request for protection under the Convention Against Torture. They have therefore waived appellate review of this claim. See Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004).

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED