

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1553

DINA ABIGAIL VASQUEZ RAMOS,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: July 28, 2023

Decided: August 29, 2023

Before RUSHING and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Nash Fayad, FAYAD LAW, P.C., Richmond, Virginia, for Petitioner. Brian M. Boynton, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Kohsei Ugumori, David J. Schor, Senior Litigation Counsel, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dina Abigail Vasquez Ramos, a native and citizen of Honduras, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing her appeal from the Immigration Judge's decision denying her applications for asylum and withholding of removal.* After thoroughly reviewing the record and considering the parties' arguments, we discern no reversible error in the Board's decision. *See Ullah v. Garland*, 72 F.4th 597, 602 (4th Cir. 2023) (explaining our standard of review). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. *In re Vasquez Ramos* (B.I.A. Apr. 18, 2022). 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

* The immigration judge also denied Vasquez Ramos' application for protection under the Convention Against Torture. The Board ruled that Vasquez Ramos had waived review of that denial by failing to meaningfully challenge it on appeal. Vasquez Ramos' opening brief in this court does not contest the Board's ruling. Vasquez Ramos has thus forfeited our review of the denial of her application for protection under the Convention Against Torture. *See United States v. Cohen*, 888 F.3d 667, 685 (4th Cir. 2018) (recognizing that issue not raised in opening brief is forfeited).