

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 16-60160
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 3, 2017

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

MOHAMED JOSHIM UDDIN, Also Known as Jasim Uddin,

Petitioner,

versus

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS, III, U.S. Attorney General,

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of
the Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A 202 158 552

Before JOLLY, SMITH, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Mohamed Uddin, a native and citizen of Bangladesh, petitions for review

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 16-60160

of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”). He challenges the denial of his applications for asylum, withholding of removal under the Immigration & Nationality Act, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”).

The BIA concluded that the record supported an adverse credibility finding and that Uddin’s evidence was “insufficiently persuasive” to establish his eligibility for relief from removal. Given the inconsistencies in Uddin’s testimonial and documentary evidence that the BIA noted, Uddin has not shown that the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. *See Wang v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 531, 538 (5th Cir. 2009); *Efe v. Ashcroft*, 293 F.3d 899, 908 (5th Cir. 2002).

As for Uddin’s claims that the BIA erred in failing to address the other grounds of denial explained by the immigration judge, those challenges have not been exhausted. *See Claudio v. Holder*, 601 F.3d 316, 318 (5th Cir. 2010). Uddin did not assert them to the BIA in his notice to appeal or in a subsequent brief, and the BIA did not address them. Accordingly, we lack jurisdiction over those unexhausted claims. *See id.*

The petition for review is DENIED in part and DISMISSED in part.