

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 21-1018**

---

ANDY CARL KUM,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: December 21, 2021

Decided: December 22, 2021

---

Before KING and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Payne, PAYNE & ASSOCIATES, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Brian B. Boynton, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Anthony D. Nicastro, Assistant Director, Timothy Bo Stanton, Trial Attorney, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Andy Carl Kum, who claims to be a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals denying Kum’s third motion to reopen his removal proceedings as time- and number-barred. Upon review, Kum’s brief in this court fails to raise any arguments that respond to, or meaningfully challenge, the Board’s rationale for denying his motion. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A) (“[T]he argument . . . 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.”). It is well established that “[f]ailure to comply with the specific dictates of [Rule 28] with respect to a particular claim triggers abandonment of that claim on appeal.” *Edwards v. City of Goldsboro*, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999). Accordingly, we agree with the Attorney General that Kum has waived appellate review of the Board’s order, *see Suarez-Valenzuela v. Holder*, 714 F.3d 241, 248-49 (4th Cir. 2013) (noting issues not raised in appellate brief are waived), and thus we deny the petition for review.

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*