

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 14, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 21-60451
Summary Calendar

MARIA DE LA CRUZ JIMENEZ-DE CERPAS; JOSE MANUEL
CERPAS-JIMENEZ; JORGE HUMBERTO CERPAS-JIMENEZ; ELBER
HUMBERTO CERPAS-JIMENEZ,

Petitioners,

versus

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

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A206 769 618
Agency No. A206 769 619
Agency No. A206 769 620
Agency No. A206 769 621

Before STEWART, DUNCAN, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Maria De La Cruz Jimenez-De Cerpas, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions for review a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing her appeal from a decision of an Immigration Judge (IJ) concluding that she was ineligible for asylum and withholding of removal.¹ We review the decision of the BIA for substantial evidence. *Zhang v. Gonzales*, 432 F.3d 339, 344 (5th Cir. 2005). Additionally, we consider the IJ's decision only to the extent that it influenced the BIA. *Singh v. Sessions*, 880 F.3d 220, 224 (5th Cir. 2018).

Jimenez-De Cerpas has not shown that the evidence compels a conclusion contrary to that of the BIA on the question whether she showed it was unreasonable to expect her to relocate within El Salvador. *See Munoz-Granados v. Barr*, 958 F.3d 402, 407 (5th Cir. 2020); *Lopez-Gomez v. Ashcroft*, 263 F.3d 442, 446 (5th Cir. 2001); 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(b)(2)(ii)). Accordingly, she has not shown that the evidence compels a conclusion contrary to that of the BIA on the issue whether she showed eligibility for asylum and withholding. *See Zhang*, 432 F.3d at 344; *Efe v. Ashcroft*, 293 F.3d 899, 906 (5th Cir. 2002). Her argument concerning the BIA's use of the "one central reason" standard to assess her withholding claim is, as she concedes, foreclosed. *See Vasquez-Guerra v. Garland*, 7 F.4th 265, 271 (5th Cir. 2021), *cert. denied*, 142 S. Ct. 1228 (2022). The petition for review is DENIED.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

¹ The respondents are a mother and her minor children.