

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1400**

---

TSEDEKE TESHONE MEKONNEN, a/k/a Tsedeke Teshone Mekonen,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: April 19, 2016

Decided: April 29, 2016

---

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

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alan M. Parra, LAW OFFICES OF ALAN M. PARRA, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Jesse M. Bless, Senior Litigation Counsel, Lance L. Jolley, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Tsedeke Teshone Mekonnen, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his requests for asylum and withholding of removal.\* We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Mekonnen'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, 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 Mekonnen (B.I.A. Mar. 17, 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

---

\* Mekonnen does not challenge the denial of relief under the Convention Against Torture. Accordingly, review of that issue is waived. See Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004).