## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

> **FILED** August 5, 2008

No. 07-60728 Summary Calendar

Charles R. Fulbruge III Clerk

JEFFERSON JARAMILLO-CHANG

Petitioner

V.

MICHAEL B MUKASEY, U S ATTORNEY GENERAL

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals BIA No. A94 895 763

Before DAVIS, GARZA and PRADO, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM:\*

Jefferson Jaramillo-Chang, a native and citizen of Colombia, petitions this court for review of an order from the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) denying his motion to reopen his removal proceedings. Jaramillo-Chang argues that the BIA erred by denying his motion to reopen to consider new evidence in support of his asylum claim. To the extent that Jaramillo-Chang's motion to reopen was based upon his eligibility for other claims for relief, he has

<sup>\*</sup> Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

abandoned those other claims. See Soadjede v. Ashcroft, 324 F.3d 830, 833 (5th Cir. 2003) (issues not raised in alien's brief in support of his petition for review of decision by BIA were deemed abandoned).

This court reviews for an abuse of discretion when the BIA denies a motion to reopen based upon a failure to establish a prima facie case for the relief sought. Pritchett v. INS, 993 F.2d 80, 83 (5th Cir. 1993). Jaramillo-Chang's asylum claim was denied because he failed to establish past persecution and because he failed to show a nexus between the harm he feared and any protected ground. Moreover, the threat to Jaramillo-Chang was not country-wide, as he had lived in other parts of Colombia without being threatened. The new evidence offered by Jaramillo-Chang in his motion to reopen did not resolve those deficiencies. The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Jaramillo-Chang's motion to reopen. Id.

Jaramillo-Chang's petition for review is DENIED.