

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1418

WILLIAM ANTONIO CLAROS REYES,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 18-1893

WILLIAM ANTONIO CLAROS REYES,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: March 1, 2019

Decided: April 19, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Petitions denied in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Brian P. Casson, NORTHERN VIRGINIA IMMIGRATION LAW FIRM, PLLC, Falls Church, Virginia, for Petitioner. Joseph H. Hunt, Assistant Attorney General, Leslie McKay, Senior Litigation Counsel, Christina P. Greer, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Antonio Claros Reyes, 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 denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture and the Board's subsequent order denying reconsideration. With regard to Reyes' asylum application, we lack jurisdiction to review the agency's determination that Reyes failed to demonstrate changed circumstances excusing the untimeliness of his application. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2012). Reyes' contention that he raises a reviewable constitutional claim or question of law, *see Zambrano v. Sessions*, 878 F.3d 84, 87 (4th Cir. 2017), is without merit. Accordingly, we dismiss the petitions for review as to this issue. For Reyes' remaining claims, we deny the petitions for review for the reasons stated by the Board. *See In re Reyes* (B.I.A. March 15, 2018 & July 31, 2018). 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.

*PETITIONS DENIED IN PART,
DISMISSED IN PART*