

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

June 16, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 20-61196
Summary Calendar

ANA VERENISE ALVARADO DE ALVARADO,

Petitioner,

versus

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

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A202 028 464

Before WIENER, DENNIS, and HAYNES, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Ana Verenise Alvarado De Alvarado petitions for review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing her appeal from a decision of the Immigration Judge (IJ) concluding that she was ineligible for asylum and withholding of removal. We review challenges to the BIA's

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-61196

determination that Alvarado De Alvarado was ineligible for relief under the substantial evidence standard. *See Zhang v. Gonzales*, 432 F.3d 339, 344 (5th Cir. 2005). Additionally, we review the decision of the BIA and consider the IJ's decision only insofar as it influenced the BIA. *See Singh v. Sessions*, 880 F.3d 220, 224 (5th Cir. 2018).

Before this court, Alvarado De Alvarado contends that the IJ and BIA erred in concluding that her particular social group, defined as “unmarried Salvadoran women who live in rural areas controlled by organized criminal organizations,” was not cognizable. She has not shown that the evidence compels a conclusion contrary to that of the BIA and thus has not met the substantial evidence standard with respect to this issue. *See Jaco v. Garland*, 24 F.4th 395, 407 (5th Cir. 2021); *Orellana-Monson v. Holder*, 685 F.3d 511, 521-22 (5th Cir. 2012); *see also Zhang*, 432 F.3d at 344. As a result, Alvarado De Alvarado has shown no error in the BIA's conclusion that she was ineligible for relief, and there is no need for us to consider her remaining arguments. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976); *Orellana-Monson*, 685 F.3d at 521-22; *Efe v. Ashcroft*, 293 F.3d 899, 906 (5th Cir. 2002). Accordingly, the petition for review is DENIED.