

UNPUBLISHED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Petition denied in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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