UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1600

SAJJAD UL HASSAN

Petitioner

v.

TODD BLANCHE, Attorney General

Respondent.

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

Submitted: May 11, 2026 Decided: August 25, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, HARRIS, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Anna A. Tijerina, Daniel I. Smulow, GRIFFITH IMMIGRATION LAW, Baltimore, Maryland, for Petitioner. Brett A. Shumate, Assistant Attorney General, Sheri R. Glaser, Joanna L. Watson, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sajjad Ul Hassan, a native of Pakistan, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing his appeal from the Immigration Judge's (IJ) decision denying Ul Hassan's applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").

We have reviewed the administrative record, including the transcript of the merits hearing and all supporting evidence, and considered the arguments raised on appeal 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 IJ's dispositive ruling, affirmed by the BIA, that Ul Hassan has failed to establish the requisite nexus between the claimed protected ground and the asserted past persecution or the feared future persecution, *see Toledo-Vasquez v. Garland*, 27 F.4th 281, 287–91 (4th Cir. 2022) (reiterating that not every threat that identifies or references a noncitizen's protected social group " 'is made on account of' " that group and "that the nexus requirement is primarily about the persecutor's reasons for targeting an individual" (quoting *Hernandez-Avalos v. Lynch*, 784 F.3d 944, 950 n.7 (4th Cir. 2015))). *See also Cedillos-Cedillos v. Barr*, 962 F.3d 817, 824 (4th Cir. 2020) (explaining that, in conducting substantial evidence review related to the agency's nexus determination, this court " 'is limited to considering whether [the agency's] conclusion is 'supported by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence' " (quoting *Cruz v. Sessions*, 853 F.3d 122, 128 (4th Cir. 2017))).

We have also reviewed Ul Hassan's claims challenging the denial of CAT protection, *see Cabrera Vasquez v. Barr*, 919 F.3d 218, 222 (4th Cir. 2019) (stating standard of review), and conclude that substantial evidence supports denial of relief.

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