

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1193

JULIO CESAR ARGUETA-RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 15-1440

JULIO CESAR ARGUETA-RODRIGUEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

Submitted: October 20, 2015

Decided: October 27, 2015

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randall L. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C., Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Benjamin C. Mizer, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Terri J. Scadron, Senior Litigation Counsel, Hillel R. Smith, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Julio Cesar Argueta-Rodriguez, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of orders of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal of the Immigration Judge's denial of his applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture, and denying reconsideration. We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of the merits hearing, the applications for relief, and all supporting evidence. We conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative findings of fact, see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the Board's decision. See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). We further find no abuse of discretion in the Board's decision denying reconsideration. See Narine v. Holder, 559 F.3d 246, 249 (4th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, we deny the petitions for review for the reasons stated by the Board. See In re: Argueta-Rodriguez (B.I.A. Jan. 26 & Mar. 26, 2015). 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.

PETITIONS DENIED