

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**  
To be cited only in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**For the Seventh Circuit**  
**Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted November 9, 2016\*  
Decided November 14, 2016

**Before**

DIANE P. WOOD, *Chief Judge*

JOEL M. FLAUM, *Circuit Judge*

DIANE S. SYKES, *Circuit Judge*

No. 16-2409

LUIS A. ALVAREZ-VICENTE,  
*Petitioner,*

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

*v.*

No. A206-305-038

LORETTA E. LYNCH,  
Attorney General of the United States,  
*Respondent.*

**ORDER**

Luis Alvarez-Vicente, a 36-year-old native and citizen of Mexico, unlawfully entered the United States in 1999. In 2013 he married Rosalba Vega, a United States citizen, and two years later pleaded guilty in Indiana state court to domestic battery. Department of Homeland Security officials then initiated removal proceedings, charging him with being an alien present in the United States without being admitted. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i). Alvarez-Vicente admitted the charged allegations, but requested cancellation of removal, *see id.* § 1229b(b), as well as asylum, *id.* § 1158, withholding of

---

\* We have unanimously agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

removal, 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(b), and protection under the Convention Against Torture, *id.* § 1208.16(c). He argued that his removal would cause hardship for his wife, who was ill, and that he would be in danger from three childhood sexual abusers if he returned to Mexico. The immigration judge denied Alvarez-Vicente's applications and ordered that he be removed to Mexico. The Board of Immigration Appeals affirmed.

Alvarez-Vicente appeals the Board's decision, but his filing does not include a brief addressing the agency's opinion. Instead he has excerpted documents from the administrative record, including letters he submitted to the Board requesting relief. But even pro se litigants must comply with Rule 28(a)(8) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, which requires appellants to submit a brief that contains a cogent argument and reasoning to support it. *See Trentadue v. Redmon*, 619 F.3d 648, 654 (7th Cir. 2010); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). By not presenting any argument that contests the Board's decision, Alvarez-Vicente has waived any challenges to that decision. *See Korsunskiy v. Gonzales*, 461 F.3d 847, 850 (7th Cir. 2006); *Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545.

DISMISSED.