

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1360**

---

FIDEL ANGEL VASQUEZ GONZALEZ,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

KIMBERLY ZANNOTTI, United States Citizenship and  
Immigration Services, Washington Field Office Director;  
ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General, Department of  
Justice; JEH JOHNSON, Secretary of the Department of  
Homeland Security; LEON RODRIGUEZ, Director, United States  
Citizenship and Immigration Services,

Respondents - Appellees,

and

RAND BEERS, Acting Secretary, Department of Homeland  
Security,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, Senior  
District Judge. (1:13-cv-01230-TSE-JFA)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2014

Decided: November 3, 2014

---

Before SHEDD and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit  
Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Christopher A. Bowen, Nancy Noonan, ARENT FOX LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellant. Dana J. Boente, United States Attorney, Antonia M. Konkoly, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Fidel Angel Vasquez Gonzalez filed a petition in the district court for a writ of mandamus seeking an order compelling the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to adjudicate his Form I-485 application for adjustment of status. The district court dismissed the petition against USCIS as moot based on its finding that USCIS lacked jurisdiction over the adjustment application and had already administratively closed and dismissed the application. On appeal, Vasquez Gonzalez challenges this finding. We have reviewed the administrative record and agree that USCIS does not have jurisdiction over the adjustment application. Accordingly, we affirm the dismissal of the mandamus petition for the reasons stated by the district court. Gonzalez v. Rodriguez, No. 1:13-cv-01230-TSE-JFA (E.D. Va. Feb. 12, 2014). 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.

AFFIRMED