

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-2090

ELVIN OMAR ROMERO-LOPEZ; ANGELA JOHANY ROMERO-RIVERA,

Petitioners,

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: August 27, 2024

Decided: September 5, 2024

Before KING and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: John W. Goodman, Simon Sandoval-Moshenberg, MURRAY OSORIO PLLC, Fairfax, Virginia, for Petitioner. Brian Boynton, Principal Deputy Attorney General, Zoe J. Heller, Senior Litigation Counsel, Erik R. Quick, Trial Attorney, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Elvin Omar Romero-Lopez and his daughter, natives and citizens of Honduras, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“Board”) dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying Romero-Lopez’s applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. We deny the petition for review.

We have reviewed the record and the Board’s order and conclude that there was no error in the Board’s analysis of the IJ’s findings that Romero-Lopez did not show that the Honduran government was unable or unwilling to protect him from his persecutors. *See Diaz de Gomez v. Wilkinson*, 987 F.3d 359, 365 (4th Cir. 2021) (stating proper standard when private actor is source of persecution or fear of persecution). We also conclude that the Petitioners fail to show that the Board engaged in improper factfinding. We have also considered the Petitioners’ claim that the Board failed to consider that one of Romero-Lopez’s alleged persecutors was a government official acting under color of law and find the claim lacks merit.

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