

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 6, 2023

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 22-60319
Summary Calendar

MIGUEL SOTO HINOJOS,

Petitioner,

versus

MERRICK GARLAND, *U.S. Attorney General,*

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A034 574 483

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, GRAVES, and HO, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Miguel Soto Hinojos, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of an order by the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing his appeal from the denial of his application for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 22-60319

We review the BIA's decision and consider the immigration judge's decision only to the extent it influenced the BIA. *Singh v. Sessions*, 880 F.3d 220, 224 (5th Cir. 2018). Factual findings are reviewed for substantial evidence and legal determinations are reviewed de novo. *Lopez-Gomez v. Ashcroft*, 263 F.3d 442, 444 (5th Cir. 2001).

Soto Hinojos has abandoned all issues raised for review by failing to adequately brief them. *See Soadjede v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 830, 833 (5th Cir. 2003). While Soto Hinojos contends that he demonstrated that he was entitled to withholding of removal, the brief fails to address the BIA's finding that he waived any challenge to his withholding claim by not presenting it to the immigration judge. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas Cnty. Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Similarly, with respect to his CAT claim, Soto Hinojos fails to address the BIA's conclusion that he waived any challenge to the immigration judge's finding that he could safely relocate within Mexico to avoid torture. *See Brinkmann*, 813 F.2d at 748. Moreover, Soto Hinojos's scant and conclusory argument regarding his CAT claim fails to offer supporting record citations or to explain how the cited legal authorities support his argument. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A).

Accordingly, Soto Hinojos's petition for review is DENIED. Additionally, the Government's motion to dismiss is DENIED, and retained counsel's motion to withdraw is DENIED as unnecessary.