

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1510

ANGELE MBAKO SOPI,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: February 20, 2015

Decided: March 2, 2015

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed in part, denied in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Danielle Beach-Oswald, BEACH-OSWALD IMMIGRATION LAW ASSOCIATES, PC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Joyce R. Branda, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Michelle G. Latour, Deputy Director, Victor M. Lawrence, Senior Litigation Counsel, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Angele Mbako Sopi, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing her appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of her requests for asylum, withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

Sopi first challenges the agency's determination that she failed to file her asylum application within one year of her arrival in the United States, and failed to qualify for an exception to excuse the untimely filing. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(2)(B) (2012); 8 C.F.R. § 1208.4(a)(2) (2014). We lack jurisdiction to review this determination pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2012), and find that Sopi has not raised any claims that would fall under the exception set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) (2012). See Gomis v. Holder, 571 F.3d 353, 358-59 (4th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, we dismiss this portion of the petition for review.

Sopi next contends that the agency erred in its alternative finding that she failed to establish eligibility for asylum and withholding of removal, and that she did not qualify for CAT protection. We have thoroughly reviewed the record and conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the agency's factual findings, see 8 U.S.C.

§ 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision. See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Accordingly, we deny the petition for review in part for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re Sopi (B.I.A. May 5, 2014).

We therefore dismiss in part and deny in part 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.

DISMISSED IN PART;
DENIED IN PART

* Sopi has filed a "motion to file brief in existing form," which we have construed as a motion for leave to file addendum to brief. Specifically, Sopi seeks to include with her opening brief a number of exhibits that were not part of the administrative record upon which the order of removal was based. Because we may not consider these documents, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(A) (2012), we deny the motion.