

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-1771**

---

CLODOALDO E. CARRANZA RIVERA,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: February 27, 2024

Decided: February 29, 2024

---

Before WILKINSON, WYNN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**ON BRIEF:** Eric H. Kirchman, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Brian Boynton, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Sabatino F. Leo, Assistant Director, Corey L. Farrell, Senior Litigation Counsel, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Clodoaldo E. Carranza Rivera, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals denying Carranza Rivera’s motion for reconsideration of the Board’s prior order affirming the immigration judge’s denial of Carranza Rivera’s application for cancellation of removal. Upon review of the record, we discern no abuse of discretion in the Board’s rationale for denying the motion to reconsider. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(a), (b)(1); *Mejia-Velasquez v. Garland*, 26 F.4th 193, 205 (4th Cir. 2022) (providing standard of review and explaining that the Board abuses its discretion only if it “acted arbitrarily, irrationally, or contrary to law” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Specifically, the Board’s order reflects its evaluation of the arguments Carranza Rivera asserted in his motion for reconsideration, which were accurately characterized as a rehash of the arguments raised and rejected in Carranza Rivera’s initial administrative appeal. Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. *See In re Carranza Rivera* (B.I.A. June 27, 2023).

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*