

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

No. 17-60488
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 1, 2018

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

MOISES MEJIA-CARTAGENA,

Petitioner

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS, III, U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A098 911 858

Before REAVLEY, WILLETT, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Moises Mejia-Cartagena, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions this court for review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing his appeal of the denial by the Immigration Judge (IJ) of the motion to reopen his in absentia removal proceedings. He argues that the BIA failed to examine the entire record, failed to apply the proper standard of review, and summarily dismissed his appeal with boilerplate responses to the issues raised

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 17-60488

in his motion to reopen. Mejia-Cartagena also argues that: (1) the BIA summarily dismissed his appeal based solely on subtle inconsistencies in his testimony and asylum application; (2) the record compels the conclusion that he belonged to a group subject to a pattern or practice of persecution; (3) he articulated specific instances of persecution and his claims were amply supported by documentation in the record; and (4) the IJ erroneously allowed the lack of corroborating evidence to be fatal to his asylum claim. These arguments are either belied by the record or wholly unrelated to the issues in Mejia-Cartagena's case.

Further, Mejia-Cartagena's conclusional assertions that he was not afforded proper notice of the hearing, that conditions in El Salvador have changed, and that exceptional circumstances warrant reopening of his removal proceedings are insufficient to adequately raise these issues before this court. *See Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993); *see also Soadjede v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 830, 833 (5th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, his petition for review is DENIED.