

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-1126**

---

YOEL REYES PEREZ,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: September 21, 2017

Decided: September 26, 2017

---

Before DUNCAN, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sean R. Hanover, HANOVER LAW, PC, Fairfax, Virginia, for Petitioner. Chad A. Readler, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Terri J. Scadron, Assistant Director, Christina P. Greer, Gregory D. Mack, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Yoel Reyes Perez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

On appeal, Reyes Perez argues that the Board erred in failing to overturn the immigration judge's finding that he failed to establish a cognizable particular social group. The Board presumed, however, for purposes of its analysis, that Reyes Perez was able to meet this nexus requirement. The Board proceeded to uphold the immigration judge's denial of withholding of removal on the ground that Reyes Perez failed to establish harm rising to the level of past persecution or establish a clear probability of future persecution if returned to Mexico. Because Reyes Perez fails to raise any arguments in his informal brief that meaningfully challenge the basis for the Board's decision, we find that he has failed to preserve any issues for review. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A) (“[T]he argument . . . must contain . . . appellant’s contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies.”); *Edwards v. City of Goldsboro*, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) (“Failure to comply with the specific dictates of [Rule 28] with respect to a particular claim triggers abandonment of that claim on appeal.”).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. *In re Reyes Perez* (B.I.A. Jan. 17, 2017). 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*