UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1542

LAZARO ISAIAS FLORES-MARTINEZ; HEIDI LIZET PEREZ-HERNANDEZ,

Petitioners,

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: August 20, 2026 Decided: August 24, 2026

Before AGEE and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Alaina Taylor, Megan Herndon, MURRAY OSORIO PLLC, Fairfax, Virginia, for Petitioners. Brett A. Shumate, Assistant Attorney General, Leslie McKay, Gregory M. Kelch, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Lazaro Isaias Flores-Martinez and his wife, Heidi Lizet Perez-Hernandez, natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge's decision denying Flores-Martinez's applications for asylum and withholding of removal.[1] We deny the petition for review.[2]

We have reviewed the administrative record, including the transcript of the merits hearing and all supporting evidence, and considered the arguments asserted in this court in conjunction with the record and the relevant authorities. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the agency's factual findings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B), and that substantial evidence supports the immigration judge's dispositive ruling, affirmed by the Board, that Flores-Martinez failed to establish the requisite nexus between the asserted past persecution or the feared future persecution and the claimed protected ground, *see Cedillos-Cedillos v. Barr*, 962 F.3d 817, 824-26 (4th Cir. 2020) (explaining that, in conducting substantial evidence review of the agency's nexus determination, this court "is limited to considering whether their conclusion is supported

[1] Ms. Perez-Hernandez was a rider on Flores-Martinez's asylum application. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(3).

[2] We observe that Flores-Martinez has forfeited review of the denial of relief under the Convention Against Torture by failing to raise that issue in his brief in this court. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Ullah v. Garland*, 72 F.4th 597, 602 (4th Cir. 2023) (explaining that a party forfeits appellate review of those issues and claims not raised in the party's briefs).

by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence" (internal quotation marks omitted)). *See generally Madrid-Montoya v. Garland*, 52 F.4th 175, 179-80 (4th Cir. 2022) (observing that, "if the record plausibly could support two results: the one the [agency] chose and the one [the noncitizen] advances," this court "must defer to the agency" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Velasquez v. Sessions*, 866 F.3d 188, 195-96 (4th Cir. 2017) (recognizing the established principle that "the asylum statute was not intended as a panacea for the numerous personal altercations that invariably characterize economic and social relationships" and distinguishing the type of personally motivated conflicts that generally "fall[ ] outside the scope of asylum protection" (citation modified)).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. *See In re Flores-Martinez* (B.I.A. Apr. 17, 2025). 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