

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 14, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 25-60481
CONSOLIDATED WITH
No. 25-60596
Summary Calendar

MILJANIC ALEXANDER MATUTE-VALLECILLO,

Petitioner,

versus

TODD WALLACE BLANCHE, *Acting U.S. Attorney General,*

Respondent.

Petitions for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A213 073 332

Before STEWART, GRAVES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Miljanic Alexander Matute-Vallecillo, a native and citizen of Honduras, petitions for review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) affirming the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of his application for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention

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

25-60481
c/w No. 25-60596

Against Torture (CAT). The Government moves for summary disposition and alternatively requests additional time to file an appellate brief. Matute-Vallecillo opposes summary disposition.

Matute-Vallecillo argues the BIA committed legal error when it affirmed the IJ's finding that he was not a credible witness and therefore ineligible for withholding of removal. He has not shown any error in the credibility ruling and, thus, this finding is dispositive of his withholding claim. *See Avelar-Oliva v. Barr*, 954 F.3d 757, 764, 767 (5th Cir. 2020); *Dayo v. Holder*, 687 F.3d 653, 658-59 (5th Cir. 2012).

We also find no merit in Matute-Vallecillo's argument that the BIA erred by not applying the governing standard for previously unavailable evidence that he submitted with a motion to remand. *See Milat v. Holder*, 755 F.3d 354, 365 (5th Cir. 2014). Finally, Matute-Vallecillo argues that the BIA did not fully consider his CAT claim and impermissibly considered the IJ's adverse credibility finding in that analysis, but the record belies that challenge. *See Arulnanthy v. Garland*, 17 F.4th 586, 597-98 (5th Cir. 2021).

The Government's motion is DENIED, and we DISPENSE with further briefing. The petition for review is DENIED.