

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-2535

XING WENG,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: June 4, 2013

Decided: June 20, 2013

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Troy Nader Moslemi, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Acting Assistant Attorney General, William C. Peachey, Assistant Director, Rebecca Hoffberg Phillips, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Xing Weng, a native and citizen of the People's Republic of China, 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 asylum and withholding of removal. We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the State Department's 2007 report on China: Profile of Asylum Claims and Country Conditions, the transcript of Weng's merits hearing, and Weng's supporting affidavit and evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the Board's factual findings, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2006), 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* for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Xing Weng (B.I.A. Nov. 20, 2012). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

* To the extent that Weng seeks review of the agency's denial of his request for protection under the Convention Against Torture, we dismiss this claim for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (2006); Massis v. Mukasey, 549 F.3d 631, 638-40 (4th Cir. 2008). As noted by the Board, Weng failed to raise any meaningful arguments before the Board in support of his eligibility for this form of relief.

before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED