

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-1440**

---

RICARDO GONZALEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: November 20, 2017

Decided: November 28, 2017

---

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied in part, dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Randall L. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, PC, Arlington, Virginia, for  
Petitioner. Chad A. Readler, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Douglas E. Ginsburg,  
Assistant Director, John M. McAdams, Jr., 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Ricardo Gonzalez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal of the immigration judge's (IJ) decision denying his applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Gonzalez's merits hearing and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to the finding that Gonzalez could safely relocate in El Salvador to avoid future persecution, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision, *INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). We further conclude that, because Gonzalez failed to exhaust his challenge to the IJ's decision denying his application for protection under the CAT, we are without jurisdiction to review that portion of his claim. *See Urbina v. Holder*, 745 F.3d 736, 741 (4th Cir. 2014) (dismissing in part petition for review for failure to exhaust).

Accordingly, 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*