

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1647

LILI AGNES DJEUKAM TASSI,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: November 17, 2014

Decided: April 6, 2015

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Danielle Beach-Oswald, BEACH-OSWALD IMMIGRATION LAW ASSOCIATES, PC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery, Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Senior Litigation Counsel, Melissa Neiman-Kelting, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Lili Agnes Djeukam Tassi, 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 Tassi's applications for adjustment of status and an 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i) (2012) waiver of inadmissibility, and denying Tassi's motion for remand.

Upon review of Tassi's claims and the administrative record, we deny the petition for review. The agency's finding that Tassi is inadmissible under 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i) (2012) is clearly supported by Tassi's admissions that she lied before the immigration judge and that she submitted a fraudulent document in support of her claims, thus distinguishing her case from our recent decision in Xing Yang Yang v. Holder, 770 F.3d 294, 305 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The record does not reveal evidence . . . that Yang made knowing and deliberate misrepresentations to gain an immigration benefit."). We also conclude that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying Tassi's motion to remand. See Onyeme v. INS, 146 F.3d 227, 234 (4th Cir. 1998) (setting forth standard of review).

We therefore deny the petition substantially for the reasons stated by the Board. In re: Tassi (B.I.A. Apr. 23, 2013). 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