

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-2286

SANTOS E. REYES, a/k/a Santos E. Reyes Chicas,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: June 19, 2015

Decided: August 7, 2015

Before SHEDD, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randall L. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C., Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Anthony C. Payne, Assistant Director, Jesse M. Bless, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Santos E. Reyes, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his applications for asylum and withholding of removal and preterminating his application for cancellation of removal. We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Reyes' merits hearing 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 denial of asylum and withholding of removal in this case.* See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Finally, Reyes' argument to undermine the decision to pretermite his application for cancellation of removal is squarely foreclosed by our recent decision in Hernandez v. Holder, 783 F.3d 189 (4th Cir. 2015).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board, see In re: Reyes (B.I.A. Oct. 27,

* The immigration judge further denied relief under the Convention Against Torture, and Reyes did not challenge this disposition in his administrative appeal. Thus, to the extent that Reyes seeks review of that ruling, we lack jurisdiction to review it due to Reyes' failure to administratively exhaust the issue. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (2012); Kporlor v. Holder, 597 F.3d 222, 226 (4th Cir. 2010)

2014), and in light of Hernandez. 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 DENIED