

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-2185

DILMA ARELY SANCHEZ-SANCHEZ; I.Y.S.,

Petitioners,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: April 23, 2020

Decided: May 19, 2020

Before KEENAN, DIAZ, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Donald L. Schlemmer, Kate B. Yi, Law Clerk, Washington, D.C., for Petitioners. Joseph H. Hunt, Assistant Attorney General, Mary Jane Candaux, Assistant Director, Stephanie E. Beckett, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Dilma Arely Sanchez-Sanchez and her minor daughter, I.Y.S., natives and citizens of Honduras, appeal an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“Board”) dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge’s decision denying Sanchez-Sanchez’s applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”).^{*} 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 agency’s factual findings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2018), and that substantial evidence supports the Board’s decision, *see INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992) (stating standard of review for denial of asylum); *Dankam v. Gonzales*, 495 F.3d 113, 124 (4th Cir. 2007) (stating standard of review for denial of CAT protection). Further, we find the due process claim to be unavailing because the alleged error did not impact the outcome of the case. *See Nardea v. Sessions*, 876 F.3d 675, 681 (4th Cir. 2017) (stating standard for due process claim).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. *See In re Sanchez-Sanchez* (B.I.A. Sept. 30, 2019). 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

^{*} I.Y.S. was a derivative asylum applicant. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(3) (2018).