

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-1254

CANDIDO DELOS ANGELEZ MARTINEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: August 24, 2020

Decided: August 28, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and MOTZ and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Candido Delos Angeles Martinez, Petitioner Pro Se. Robert Michael Stalzer, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Candido Delos Angeles Martinez (“Martinez”), a native and citizen of El Salvador, has filed a pro se petition for review of the order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming the Immigration Judge’s written decision (1) finding Martinez’s application for asylum was time-barred; and (2) denying on the merits Martinez’s applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). However, even affording Martinez’s pro se informal brief a liberal construction, *see Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (instructing courts to liberally construe pro se documents), we conclude that Martinez has failed to challenge any aspect of the Immigration Judge’s dispositive rationale, which the Board expressly adopted by affirming the order of removal for the reasons set forth by the Immigration Judge. We therefore hold that Martinez has forfeited appellate review of the Board’s order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) (“The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief.”).

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