

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1057

JULIO FREDY VILLAFUERTE PORTELA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: September 3, 2015 Decided: September 17, 2015

Before WILKINSON and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald D. Richey, LAW OFFICE OF RONALD D. RICHEY, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Jennifer P. Levings, Senior Litigation Counsel, Nancy K. Canter, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Julio Fredy Villafuerte Portela, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's order denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the various documentary exhibits, the transcript of Villafuerte Portela's merits hearing, and his supporting affidavit. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the agency's 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: Villafuerte Portela (B.I.A. Dec. 16, 2014). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

* Villafuerte Portela failed to challenge before the Board the denial of his application for protection under the CAT. Accordingly, we are without jurisdiction to review that decision. Tiscareno-Garcia v. Holder, 780 F.3d 205, 210 (4th Cir. 2015).

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

PETITION DENIED