

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1943

NISHAN SINGH,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: January 27, 2016

Decided: February 12, 2016

Before GREGORY and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nishan Singh, Petitioner Pro Se. Linda Y. Cheng, Sheri Robyn Glaser, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nishan Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of Singh's requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

We have reviewed the record, including the transcript of Singh'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 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). Particularly, as relevant to Singh's applications for asylum and withholding of removal, we find that substantial evidence supports the Board's affirmance of the immigration judge's conclusion that Singh's membership in either of the proposed social groups was not "one central reason" for the past harm he sustained or the future harm he feared. See Hui Pan v. Holder, 737 F.3d 921, 926 (4th Cir. 2013) (noting that this court reviews factual findings for "substantial evidence"); Crespin-Valladares v. Holder, 632 F.3d 117, 127-28 (4th Cir. 2011) (explaining that a persecutor's motive is "a classic factual question" that the Board reviews for clear error).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Singh (B.I.A. July 21, 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