

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-1101

OSCAR DAVID SANCHEZ SANTOS,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: September 12, 2019

Decided: September 20, 2019

Before FLOYD and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John E. Gallagher, Catonsville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Joseph H. Hunt, Assistant Attorney General, Stephen J. Flynn, Assistant Director, Ann M. Welhaf, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Oscar David Sanchez Santos, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his requests for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture. We deny the petition for review.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record, including the transcript of Sanchez Santos' merits hearing and all supporting evidence. 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) (2012), and that substantial evidence supports the agency's conclusion that the Department of Homeland Security rebutted any presumption of a well-founded fear of persecution by establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Sanchez Santos could "avoid a future threat to his . . . life or freedom by relocating to another part of [El Salvador] and, under all the circumstances, it would be reasonable to expect [him] to do so." 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(b)(1)(B) (2019). We further conclude that substantial evidence supports the denial of protection under the Convention Against Torture. *See Dankam v. Gonzales*, 495 F.3d 113, 124 (4th Cir. 2007).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. *In re Sanchez Santos*, (B.I.A. Dec. 27, 2018). 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