

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

No. 18-60815
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 23, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

DANIEL ROSAS PEREZ,

Petitioner

v.

WILLIAM P. BARR, U. S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A206 977 608

Before DAVIS, SMITH, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Daniel Rosas Perez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) affirming the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of withholding of removal and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

Because the BIA affirmed the IJ's decision without opinion, the IJ's decision is the final agency determination for purposes of judicial review. *See*

* 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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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. 18-60815

Soadjede v. Ashcroft, 324 F.3d 830, 831-32 (5th Cir. 2003). Questions of law are reviewed de novo and findings of fact are reviewed for substantial evidence. *Shaikh v. Holder*, 588 F.3d 861, 863 (5th Cir. 2009). Under the substantial evidence standard, the petitioner “must show that the evidence was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could conclude against it.” *Wang v. Holder*, 569 F.3d 531, 537 (5th Cir. 2009).

Rosas Perez asserts that the evidence supports that he likely would be persecuted on account of his membership in a particular social group: males between the ages of 20 to 40 who have not lived in Mexico for several years. However, the evidence does not compel a finding that Rosas Perez has a well-founded fear of future harm because he belongs to a particular social group. *See id.* He has not demonstrated that his proposed particular social group is cognizable. *See Gonzalez-Soto v. Lynch*, 841 F.3d 682, 684 (5th Cir. 2016); *Orellana-Monson v. Holder*, 685 F.3d 511, 518-19 (5th Cir. 2012). In addition, Rosas Perez has failed to brief, and thereby abandoned, any argument involving the IJ’s denial of CAT protection. *See Soadjede*, 324 F.3d at 833.

The petition for review is DENIED.