

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-1924**

---

KOKOUVI AMOUZOU,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: December 21, 2017

Decided: March 13, 2018

---

Before WILKINSON, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kokouvi Amouzou, Petitioner Pro Se. Chad A. Readler, Kristen Giuffreda Chapman, Jennifer Parker Levings, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Kokouvi Amouzou, a native and citizen of Togo, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's decision denying 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 Amouzou's merits hearing before the immigration court and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to the administrative factual findings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that the Board did not abuse its discretion in finding that Amouzou's conviction was a particularly serious crime. *See Gao v. Holder*, 595 F.3d 549, 556-57 (4th Cir. 2010) (noting standard of review). We also conclude that substantial evidence supports the finding that Amouzou failed to establish eligibility for deferral of removal under the CAT. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992) (stating standard of review). Additionally, because Amouzou failed to substantially comply with the requirements under *In re Lozada*, 19 I. & N. Dec. 637 (B.I.A. 1988), we will not review his claim that counsel was ineffective. *See Barry v. Gonzales*, 445 F.3d 741, 745-47 (4th Cir. 2006). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We also deny Amouzou's motion to reconsider the order denying his motion for stay. 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*