

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1594**

---

ASHISH SHRESTHA,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: February 18, 2016

Decided: March 15, 2016

---

Before AGEE and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kevin H. Knutson, Sacramento, California, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant, Derek C. Julius, Senior Litigation Counsel, Andrew B. Insenga, Nelle M. Seymour, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Ashish Shrestha, a native and citizen of Nepal, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of his requests for asylum and withholding of removal.\* We have reviewed the administrative record, including the transcript of Shrestha's merits hearing, the applications for relief, and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative findings of fact, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision to uphold the denial of the applications for relief. See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). We accordingly deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Shrestha (B.I.A. May 7, 2015). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

---

\* Shreshtha failed to challenge the agency's denial of his request for protection under the Convention Against Torture. He has therefore waived appellate review of this claim. See Suarez-Valenzuela v. Holder, 714 F.3d 241, 248-49 (4th Cir. 2013).

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED