

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1129

JACINTA NEH FON,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: November 19, 2015

Decided: December 2, 2015

Before WILKINSON and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition dismissed in part and denied in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald D. Richey, LAW OFFICE OF RONALD D. RICHEY, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Song Park, Senior Litigation Counsel, Brendan P. Hogan, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Jacinta Neh Fon, 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 her requests for asylum, withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

Fon first challenges the agency's determination that her asylum application is time-barred, and contends that she qualified for asylum. See 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(2)(B) (2012); 8 C.F.R. § 1208.4(a)(2) (2015). We lack jurisdiction to review this determination pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2012), and find that Fon has not raised any claims that would fall under the exception set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(D) (2012). See Gomis v. Holder, 571 F.3d 353, 358-59 (4th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, we dismiss the petition for review with respect to Fon's asylum claim.

Fon next contends that the agency erred in finding that she failed to establish eligibility for withholding of removal or protection under the Convention Against Torture. We have thoroughly reviewed the record and 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) (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: Fon (B.I.A. Jan. 9, 2015).

We therefore dismiss in part and deny in part 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 DISMISSED IN PART
AND DENIED IN PART