

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1567**

---

MARITZA ISABEL BARRIGA-VEGA; RAFAEL ARTURO VELASQUEZ-  
MARTINEZ; HARLEY SEBASTIAN VELASQUEZ-BARRIGA; ANGIE  
VELASQUEZ-BARRIGA; G.V.,

Petitioners,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: November 17, 2015                      Decided: December 30, 2015

---

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

---

Petition denied in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per  
curiam opinion.

---

Daniel Christmann, CHRISTMANN LEGAL IMMIGRATION LAW, Charlotte,  
North Carolina, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Justin Markel, Senior  
Litigation Counsel, Benjamin J. Zeitlin, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Rafael Arturo Velasquez-Martinez, his wife, Maritza Isabel Barriga-Vega, and their three children, natives and citizens of Colombia, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge's denial of Velasquez-Martinez's requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Velasquez-Martinez'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 in part for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Barriga-Vega (B.I.A. Apr. 27, 2015).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Velasquez-Martinez's challenges to the immigration judge's denial of his request for protection under the Convention Against Torture on the ground that he failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (2012); Massis v. Mukasey, 549 F.3d 631, 638-40 (4th Cir. 2008). We therefore dismiss this portion of 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 IN PART  
AND DISMISSED IN PART