

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1682

NELSON RODRIGUEZ, a/k/a Nelson Rodriguez Rodriguez, a/k/a
Frankie Ramirez, a/k/a Frankin Ramirez,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: September 29, 2016

Decided: October 3, 2016

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied in part, dismissed in part by unpublished per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

Nelson Rodriguez, Petitioner Pro Se. Robbin Kinmonth Blaya, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Nelson Rodriguez, a native and citizen of Honduras, 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 withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the petitioner's informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Here, the agency denied Rodriguez's application for withholding of removal on the ground that he failed to demonstrate a nexus between his fear of persecution and a protected ground. In his informal brief, Rodriguez fails to challenge the basis for the agency's denial of withholding of removal and has therefore forfeited appellate review. See Suarez-Valenzuela v. Holder, 714 F.3d 241, 248-49 (4th Cir. 2013) (deeming issues not raised in opening brief waived); Niang v. Gonzales, 492 F.3d 505, 510 n.5 (4th Cir. 2007) (same). We therefore deny the petition for review in part.

We lack jurisdiction to consider Rodriguez'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.

Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny in part and dismiss in part 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;
DISMISSED IN PART