

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1824

WALTER GUEVARA-PORTILLO,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: March 17, 2016

Decided: March 30, 2016

Before DUNCAN and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joshua A. Berman, BLAINE L. GILBERT & ASSOCIATES, PA, Baltimore, Maryland, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Linda S. Wernery, Assistant Director, Janice K. Redfern, Senior Litigation Counsel, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Walter Guevara-Portillo, 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 denial of his requests for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture.*

We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Guevara-Portillo's merits hearing and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative factual findings, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision. See Gomis, 571 F.3d at 359. Accordingly, we deny the petition for review in part for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Guevara-Portillo (B.I.A. June 26, 2015).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Guevara-Portillo's challenges to the immigration judge's denial of his request for protection under the Convention Against Torture on the ground that he failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (2012); Massis v. Mukasey, 549 F.3d 631,

* Guevara-Portillo does not challenge the denial of his asylum claim as untimely, and in any event, we lack jurisdiction to review this finding. See 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2012); Gomis v. Holder, 571 F.3d 353, 358-59 (4th Cir. 2009).

638-40 (4th Cir. 2008). We therefore dismiss this portion of 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 IN PART
AND DISMISSED IN PART