

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

September 23, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 24-60154
Summary Calendar

OFELIA MATA CASTILLO; KEYRI MICHELLE SORTO MATA;
XIOMARA CRISTAL SORTO MATA,

Petitioners,

versus

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

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency Nos. A209 138 466,
A209 138 467, A209 138 468

Before WIENER, HO, and RAMIREZ, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Ofelia Mata Castillo, Keyri Michelle Sorto Mata, and Xiomara Cristal Sorto Mata, who are natives and citizens of El Salvador, petition for review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals upholding the denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention

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

No. 24-60154

Against Torture (CAT). The claims of asylum and withholding of removal were based on the protected ground of membership in a particular social group (PSG).

We review the BIA's decision and consider the immigration judge's decision only to the extent it influenced the BIA. *See Orellana-Monson v. Holder*, 685 F.3d 511, 517 (5th Cir. 2012). The proposed PSG of "Salvadorian women unable to leave their domestic relationship" is not cognizable under our precedent because the group does not exist independently of the alleged harm and is therefore impermissibly defined in a circular manner. *See Lopez-Perez v. Garland*, 35 F.4th 953, 958 (5th Cir. 2022); *Jaco v. Garland*, 24 F.4th 395, 402-05 (5th Cir. 2021). The petitioners' contention that the proposed PSG is cognizable in light of the vacatur of *Matter of A-B-*, 27 I. & N. Dec. 316 (U.S. Att'y Gen. 2018), is unavailing, as the argument was rejected in *Jaco*, 24 F.4th at 403-05. Because the petitioners failed to establish a cognizable PSG, the BIA did not err in denying the claims of asylum or withholding of removal. *See Lopez-Perez*, 35 F.4th at 957-58; *Orellana-Monson*, 685 F.3d at 522.

As in the BIA, the petitioners do not brief any argument challenging the denial of protection under the CAT and therefore have abandoned that claim. *See Sharma v. Holder*, 729 F.3d 407, 411 n.1 (5th Cir. 2013). Additionally, the BIA's decision reflects adequate reasoning and consideration of the relevant issues to meet the procedural standard for full and fair consideration of the claims. *See Ghotra v. Whitaker*, 912 F.3d 284, 290 (5th Cir. 2019); *see also INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) ("As a general rule courts and agencies are not required to make findings on issues the decision of which is unnecessary to the results they reach.").

No. 24-60154

Accordingly, the petition for review is DENIED. The petitioners' request to place this case in abeyance, which is opposed by the respondent, also is DENIED.