

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-1191**

---

WILLIAM ALEXANDER LARA-ELIAS,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: October 24, 2017

---

Decided: November 3, 2017

---

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition dismissed in part and denied in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ronald D. Richey, LAW OFFICE OF RONALD D. RICHEY, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Chad A. Readler, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Derek C. Julius, Assistant Director, Jason Wisecup, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

William Alexander Lara-Elias, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's (IJ) denial of his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Lara-Elias' merits hearing before the immigration court and all supporting evidence. We conclude that we are without jurisdiction to review the agency's finding that Lara-Elias' asylum application is time-barred. *See Mulyani v. Holder*, 771 F.3d 190, 196-97 (4th Cir. 2014) (noting that express language of 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2012) prevents review of IJ's finding that applicant did not establish changed or extraordinary circumstances). Accordingly, we dismiss in part the petition for review. Concerning the Board's denial of withholding of removal and protection under the CAT, 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 dismiss in part and deny 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 DISMISSED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART***