

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1059

MANUEL ALVALLEROS-AREVALO, a/k/a Manuel Dejesus Alvarado,
a/k/a Manuel Dejesus Alvayero Arevalo, a/k/a Manuel
Alvallero,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: August 17, 2015

Decided: September 2, 2015

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jay S. Marks, LAW OFFICES OF JAY S. MARKS, LLC, Silver Spring,
Maryland, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy
Assistant Attorney General, Ernesto H. Molina, Jr., Assistant
Director, Anthony P. Nicastro, Senior Litigation Counsel, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Manuel Alvalleros-Arevalo (Arevalo), a native and citizen of El Salvador, 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. We deny the petition for review.

Arevalo disputes the conclusion that he failed to qualify for the relief of withholding of removal. "Withholding of removal is available under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3) [(2012)] if the alien shows that it is more likely than not that [his] life or freedom would be threatened in the country of removal because of [his] race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." Gomis v. Holder, 571 F.3d 353, 359 (4th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted); see 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3). We have reviewed the record and conclude that substantial evidence supports the agency's determination that Arevalo failed to demonstrate a clear probability of future persecution on account of a protected ground. Because the evidence does not compel us to conclude to the contrary, we uphold the denial of relief. See Gomis, 571 F.3d at 359-60.

We also uphold as supported by substantial evidence the finding below that Arevalo did not demonstrate that it is more

likely than not that he would be tortured if removed to El Salvador so as to qualify for protection under the Convention Against Torture. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2014).

We accordingly deny 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 DENIED