

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1613

ABDALKARIM S. M. QANDEEL; MAISAA MOHD AMEEN KAME ALHINDI,

Petitioners,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH,

Respondent.

No. 14-2411

ABDALKARIM S. M. QANDEEL; MAISAA MOHD AMEEN KAME ALHINDI,

Petitioners,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH,

Respondent.

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: July 20, 2015

Decided: July 30, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ira J. Kurzban, KURZBAN KURZBAN WEINGER TETZELI & PRATT, P.A., Miami, Florida, for Petitioners. Benjamin C. Mizer, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Carl McIntyre, Assistant Director, Margaret A. O'Donnell, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Abdulkarim S.M. Qandeel, a stateless Palestinian, and his wife, derivative beneficiary Maisaa Mohd Ameen Kame Alhindi, a native of Saudi Arabia and a citizen of Jordan, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing their appeal of the Immigration Judge's denial of Qandeel's requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. Petitioners also seek review of the Board's order denying their motion to reopen. We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Qandeel's merits hearing, his asylum application, and all supporting evidence. We 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 denying relief from removal. See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). We further find that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion to reopen. See INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992).

Accordingly, we deny the petitions for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Qandeel (B.I.A. May 30 & Dec. 16, 2014). 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.

PETITIONS DENIED