## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

<del>-</del>		
_	No. 18-1563	
ZHI CHEN,		
Petitioner,		
v.		
MATTHEW G. WHITAKER, Acti	ng U.S. Attorney Ge	eneral,
Respondent.		
-		
On Petition for Review of an Order	of the Board of Imm	nigration Appeals.
Submitted: December 20, 2018		Decided: January 4, 2019
Before WILKINSON and DIAZ, C	ircuit Judges, and SI	HEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.
Petition denied by unpublished per	curiam opinion.	
Michael Brown, LAW OFFICE C Petitioner. Joseph H. Hunt, Assi Director, Annette M. Wietecha, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT	stant Attorney Gen Office of Immigra	eral, Stephen J. Flynn, Assistant ation Litigation, Civil Division,

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Zhi Chen, a native and citizen of the People's Republic of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of his request for asylum and withholding of removal.\* We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Chen's merits hearing and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the agency's 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 deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re Chen (B.I.A. May 9, 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.

PETITION DENIED

<sup>\*</sup> In his opening brief, Chen mentions the denial of protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT) and sets forth the legal standard, but he does not present any argument contesting the finding that he failed to qualify for CAT relief. We therefore find that he has waived review of his CAT claim. *See Suarez-Valenzuela v. Holder*, 714 F.3d 241, 248-49 (4th Cir. 2013).