

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1110

KENNEDY ABANDE,

Petitioner,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: July 25, 2023

Decided: July 27, 2023

Before WYNN and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Godwill C. Tachi, TACHI LAW FIRM, L.L.C., Greenbelt, Maryland, for Petitioner. Brian M. Boynton, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, David J. Schor, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jesse D. Lorenz, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Kennedy Abande, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing Abande’s appeal from the immigration judge’s decision denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. We deny the petition for review.

We have reviewed the arguments Abande presses on appeal in light of the administrative record, including the transcript of Abande’s merits hearing and the supporting evidence, and the relevant legal authorities. Despite Abande’s arguments to the contrary, we conclude that the record evidence does not compel a ruling contrary to any of the administrative factual findings, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B)—including the adverse credibility finding*—and that substantial evidence supports the denial of relief, *see INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). *See also Ilunga*, 777 F.3d at 207 (explaining that “omissions, inconsistent statements, contradictory evidence, and inherently improbable testimony are appropriate bases for making an adverse credibility determination” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. *In re Abande* (B.I.A. Jan. 10, 2023). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

* We review credibility determinations for substantial evidence, affording broad—though not unlimited—deference to the agency’s credibility findings. *Ilunga v. Holder*, 777 F.3d 199, 206 (4th Cir. 2015); *Camara v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 361, 367 (4th Cir. 2004).

adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED