

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1520

FANG SHU LIN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: October 23, 2013

Decided: October 29, 2013

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael J. Campise, FERRO & CUCCIA, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, Ernesto H. Molina, Jr., Assistant Director, Jamie M. Dowd, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Fang Shu Lin, a native and citizen of the People's Republic of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of Lin's applications for asylum, withholding of deportation, protection under the Convention Against Torture, and adjustment of status. Because Lin does not challenge the denial of his applications for asylum, withholding, or protection under the Convention Against Torture, our review is limited to the agency's finding that Lin is statutorily ineligible for adjustment of status. See Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004) (finding that failure to raise a challenge in an opening brief results in abandonment of that challenge); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) (same).

We have thoroughly reviewed the record as it pertains to Lin's application for adjustment of status and conclude that substantial evidence supports the agency's finding that Lin failed to credibly establish that he was inspected and admitted into the United States. See 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a) (2006). We therefore deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Fang Shu Lin (B.I.A. Mar. 22, 2013). 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