## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

## No. 15-1297

DORCAS WANGARI KARIUKI,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: October 27, 2015 Decided: November 17, 2015

Before DUNCAN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Liam Ge, LIAMSLAW IMMIGRATION PRACTICE, Baltimore, Maryland, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Cindy S. Ferrier, Assistant Director, Surell Brady, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Dorcas Wangari Kariuki, a native and citizen of Kenya, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's denial of her requests for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture.<sup>\*</sup> We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Kariuki's 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, <u>see</u> 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision. <u>See Gomis</u>, 571 F.3d at 359.

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. <u>In re: Kariuki</u> (B.I.A. Feb. 23, 2015). 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

2

<sup>\*</sup> Kariuki does not challenge the denial of her asylum claim as untimely, and in any event, we lack jurisdiction to review this finding. <u>See</u> 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2012); <u>Gomis v.</u> <u>Holder</u>, 571 F.3d 353, 358-59 (4th Cir. 2009).