

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 21-1725**

---

EDGAR TOMAS GALEANO-GALO,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: June 28, 2022

Decided: July 15, 2022

---

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

---

Petition dismissed in part and denied in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Edgar Tomas Galeano-Galo, Petitioner Pro Se. Patricia E. Bruckner, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Edgar Tomas Galeano-Galo, a native and citizen of Honduras, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“Board”) dismissing Galeano-Galo’s appeal from the Immigration Judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). Before us, Galeano-Galo proceeds pro se and argues that he received ineffective assistance of counsel during the immigration proceedings. He also contends—without elaboration—that the Board erred by affirming the IJ’s denial of his applications for asylum and withholding of removal. Lastly, Galeano-Galo pursues a slightly more developed challenge to the denial of his application for CAT protection. For the reasons explained below, we dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

Galeano-Galo first argues that he received ineffective assistance of counsel during the immigration proceedings. But because Galeano-Galo did not present this argument to the Board, and the Board did not resolve the issue, we lack jurisdiction to now consider it. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1); *Portillo Flores v. Garland*, 3 F.4th 615, 632-34 (4th Cir. 2021) (en banc); *Yang v. Gonzales*, 478 F.3d 133, 142 (2d Cir. 2007); *Galvez Pineda v. Gonzales*, 427 F.3d 833, 837 (10th Cir. 2005). Consequently, we dismiss the petition for review as to Galeano-Galo’s ineffective assistance of counsel argument.

Galeano-Galo also summarily contends that the Board erred by affirming the IJ’s denial of his applications for asylum and withholding of removal. Because Galeano-Galo’s informal brief does not challenge the Board’s reasons for affirming the IJ’s denial of asylum and withholding of removal, however, he has forfeited appellate review of those

aspects of the Board’s order. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (“The Court will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief.”); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) (“The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief.”). We therefore deny the petition for review as to Galeano-Galo’s asylum and withholding of removal applications.

Finally, Galeano-Galo asserts that the Board erred by affirming the IJ’s denial of his application for CAT protection. Our review of the record leads us to conclude, however, that the Board’s and the IJ’s denial of CAT protection is legally sound and supported by substantial evidence. *See Ibarra Chevez v. Garland*, 31 F.4th 279, 288-89 (4th Cir. 2022) (providing standard of review for denial of CAT protection); *Ortez-Cruz v. Barr*, 951 F.3d 190, 197 (4th Cir. 2020) (“When . . . the Board affirms the IJ’s decision with an opinion of its own, we review both decisions.” (alterations and internal quotation marks omitted)). We thus deny the petition for review as to Galeano-Galo’s application for CAT protection.

Accordingly, we dismiss in part and deny in part 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 DISMISSED IN PART  
AND DENIED IN PART*