

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 23-60624
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 10, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

JIANRONG MA,

Petitioner,

versus

MERRICK GARLAND, *U.S. Attorney General,*

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A246 567 930

Before KING, SOUTHWICK, and ENGELHARDT, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Jianrong Ma, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing his appeal from an order of an Immigration Judge (IJ). The order denied Ma's application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT) and ordered Ma's removal. We review the denial of such

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

No. 23-60624

claims for substantial evidence. *Zhang v. Gonzales*, 432 F.3d 339, 344 (5th Cir. 2005). Pursuant to this standard, we may not disturb the BIA’s decision unless the evidence “*compels*” a contrary conclusion. *Id.* We review the IJ’s order only when, as here, it influences the BIA. *Singh v. Sessions*, 880 F.3d 220, 224 (5th Cir. 2018). Ma has not made the necessary showing.

Insofar as he challenges the BIA’s rejection of his asylum and withholding claims, this challenge fails because he does not identify evidence compelling a conclusion contrary to that of the BIA as to whether he showed past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of his political opinion. *See Jaco v. Garland*, 24 F.4th 395, 401, 406–07 (5th Cir. 2021); *Singh v. Barr*, 920 F.3d 255, 259 (5th Cir. 2019); *Efe v. Ashcroft*, 293 F.3d 899, 906 (5th Cir. 2002). Similarly, his challenge to the BIA’s rejection of his CAT claim fails because he does not identify evidence compelling a conclusion contrary to that of the BIA as to whether he showed that he more likely than not will be tortured if repatriated. *See Morales v. Sessions*, 860 F.3d 812, 818 (5th Cir. 2017). The petition for review is DENIED.