

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 14-60096
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

December 23, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

SOHILBHAI SHAUKATALI MOMIN,

Petitioner

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A200 598 246

Before REAVLEY, DENNIS, and SOUTHWICK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Sohilbhai Shaukatali Momin, a native and citizen of India, has filed a petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' (BIA) order denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

Because the BIA affirmed the findings and conclusions of the Immigration Judge (IJ), we review both decisions. *Zhu v. Gonzales*, 493 F.3d

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.

No. 14-60096

588, 593-94 (5th Cir. 2007). We review an immigration court's findings of fact for substantial evidence. *Wang v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 531, 536 (5th Cir. 2009). We may not reverse an immigration court's factual findings unless "the evidence was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could conclude against it." *Id.* at 537.

Momin does not argue that the IJ or the BIA erred in determining that he had not shown past persecution. By failing to brief this issue, Momin has waived or abandoned it. *See Thuri v. Ashcroft*, 380 F.3d 788, 793 (5th Cir. 2004). He does argue that the IJ and BIA erred in determining that he had not established a well-founded fear of persecution if he returned to India. Momin argues that he has a well-founded fear of persecution as a Muslim and that a pattern or practice of persecution exists in India against Muslims. He argues that his testimony and exhibits established that there is a country-wide pattern of persecution against Muslims and that the Government is involved. He contends that the evidence showed that the violence is not concentrated in one particular area but is widespread throughout India, making it very difficult for him to relocate to a safe area.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's and the BIA's finding that Momin failed to demonstrate a pattern or practice of persecution in India against Muslims. *Wang*, 569 F.3d at 536. The IJ and BIA noted that the State Department Country Reports indicated that, despite some corruption and police inadequacies, the Indian government generally respects religious freedom and practice, that Muslims are the largest minority in India, and that the Indian government allows for freedom of movement.

Because he has not satisfied the standard for asylum, Momin cannot meet the more demanding standard for withholding of removal. *See Chen v.*

No. 14-60096

Gonzales, 470 F.3d 1131, 1138 (5th Cir. 2006); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 208.16(b)(2)(i)-(ii).

Momin does not brief any argument relating to the issue of CAT relief. By failing to brief this issue, Momin has waived or abandoned it. *See Thuri*, 380 F.3d at 793.

The petition for review is DENIED.