

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1323

SILVIA ARACELY CASTRO-CARRILLO,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: February 8, 2024

Decided: February 27, 2024

Before GREGORY and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Arnedo S. Valera, LAW OFFICES OF VALERA & ASSOCIATES P.C., Fairfax, Virginia, for Petitioner. Brian M. Boynton, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Anthony C. Payne, Assistant Director, Jeffery R. Leist, Senior Litigation Counsel, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Silvia Aracely Castro-Carrillo, a native and citizen of Guatemala, petitions for review of the order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing her appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. We have reviewed the record and Castro-Carrillo's claims and conclude that the evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative factual findings. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B). We also conclude that substantial evidence supports the finding that Castro-Carrillo did not establish that her fear of returning to Guatemala was objectively reasonable. *See INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992) (stating standard of review); *Ai Hua Chen v. Holder*, 742 F.3d 171, 178-79 (4th Cir. 2014) (stating components of well-founded fear of persecution). We further conclude that the Board did not improperly overlook Castro-Carrillo's claim that she feared persecution on account of her membership in a particular social group. And we conclude that the IJ's analysis of the aggregate risk of torture was sufficient and that substantial evidence supports the denial of protection under the CAT. Accordingly, 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