

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1088**

---

YAWA MAWUSE BEATRICE AGBENU,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: August 27, 2014

Decided: September 10, 2014

---

Before NIEMEYER, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ronald D. Richey, LAW OFFICE OF RONALD D. RICHEY, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, John S. Hogan, Senior Litigation Counsel, Laura M.L. Maroldy, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Yawa Mawuse Beatrice Agbenu, a native and citizen of Togo, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's decision denying her requests for asylum, withholding of removal and withholding under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").<sup>1</sup> We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including Agbenu's testimony, her documentary exhibits, and her supporting statements and conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative findings of fact, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision. See Figeroa v. INS, 886 F.2d 76, 78 (4th Cir. 1989); INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board.<sup>2</sup> See In re: Agbenu (B.I.A. Jan. 3, 2014). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

---

<sup>1</sup> This case has returned to the court after we granted the Attorney General's unopposed motion to remand to the Board.

<sup>2</sup> Agbenu does not challenge the Board's finding that she waived review of the denial of relief under the CAT. Accordingly, review of that issue is waived. Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004).

adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED