

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-2367

OBED RAMOS HERNANDEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: July 6, 2015

Decided: July 24, 2015

Before WYNN and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dean E. Wanderer, DEAN E. WANDERER & ASSOCIATES, Fairfax, Virginia, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Cindy S. Ferrier, Assistant Director, Brendan P. Hogan, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Obed Ramos Hernandez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board"), dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's order finding him removable and denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and withholding under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We deny the petition for review.*

Hernandez first challenges his removability as an alien convicted of an act involving moral turpitude, arguing that his forgery conviction was not a crime involving moral turpitude. It is uncontested, however, that Hernandez is removable for having entered this country without being admitted or paroled. See 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i) (2012). Accordingly, we need not consider whether he is also removable on other grounds.

Hernandez also challenges the denial of his request for withholding of removal. "[A]dministrative findings of fact are conclusive unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to conclude to the contrary." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012). A determination regarding eligibility for withholding of removal is affirmed if supported by substantial evidence in the record

* Hernandez does not challenge the denial of asylum or protection under the CAT. Thus, review of those decisions is waived. Karimi v. Holder, 715 F.3d 561, 565 n.2 (4th Cir. 2013).

considered as a whole. INS v. Elias Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). We conclude that substantial evidence supports the finding that Hernandez did not meet his burden of proof for withholding of removal.

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