

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1000

ELISEO DE LOS SANTOS BERMUDEZ-LOPEZ; J.E.B-P, a/k/a J.A.B-P,

Petitioners,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: July 26, 2018

Decided: August 8, 2018

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nancy Pulliam Quinn, THE QUINN LAW FIRM, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Petitioner. Chad A. Readler, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Bernard A. Joseph, Senior Litigation Counsel, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Eliseo De Los Santos Bermudes-Lopez and his minor son, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“Board”) dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge’s decision denying Bermudes-Lopez’s applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”).^{*} We deny the petition for review.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of the merits hearing and all supporting evidence. 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 finding that the Petitioners failed to establish a nexus between past persecution or fear of future persecution and a protected ground, *see INS v. Elias–Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992) (stating standard of review); *Oliva v. Lynch*, 807 F.3d 53, 59 (4th Cir. 2015) (noting applicant bears burden of showing past or feared persecution is on account of protected ground).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED

^{*} Petitioners do not challenge the denial of CAT relief in the argument section of the brief. Accordingly, this issue is abandoned. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A) (“[T]he argument [section of the brief] . . . 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[.]”); *see also Ngarurih v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004) (holding CAT claim not raised on appeal was abandoned).