UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2110

MUHAMMAD NABEEL,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: March 6, 2014 Decided: March 11, 2014

Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Genet Getachew, Brooklyn, New York, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, Carl McIntyre, Assistant Director, Sharon M. Clay, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Muhammad Nabeel, a citizen of Pakistan, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his requests for asylum, withholding of removal and withholding under the Convention Against Torture. We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Nabeel's merits hearing, his written statement and his documentary evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to the Board's dismissal and that substantial evidence supports the factual findings.[*] See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012); INS v. Elias–Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992).

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

[*] We note that Nabeel does not challenge the denial of his application for asylum or the finding that he did not suffer past persecution. Thus, those issues are waived. Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc., 562 F.3d 599, 607 (4th Cir. 2009) (limiting appellate review to arguments raised in the brief in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A)); Williams v. Giant Food Inc., 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir. 2004) (noting that appellate assertions not supported by argument are deemed abandoned).