

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

July 25, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 25-60029
Summary Calendar

BIBI MAZIDA MAHBOB,

Petitioner,

versus

PAMELA BONDI, *U.S. Attorney General,*

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A244 445 397

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, JONES, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Bibi Mazida Mahbob, a native and citizen of Afghanistan, petitions for review of the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) upholding the immigration judge's (IJ's) denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. The Government moves for summary disposition, but summary disposition is not appropriate given

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

No. 25-60029

Mahbob's opposition and absence of foreclosed issues. Thus, the Government's motion is DENIED.

Mahbob argues that the IJ erred in determining that she did not provide sufficient corroborating evidence for her claims. She specifically argues that the IJ erred in excluding her brother's written statement and not allowing her other brother to testify at her merits hearing based on "technicalities." She further contends that the exclusion of the written statement and disallowance of the testimony violated her due process rights.

The Government argues that Mahbob has failed to exhaust all her claims, and this court should decline to consider them. First, while Mahbob asserted in her BIA brief a challenge to the IJ's determination that she failed to provide sufficient corroborating evidence, her argument in her BIA brief was not sufficient to put the BIA on notice of the argument she now raises. *See Ibrahim v. Garland*, 19 F.4th 819, 826 (5th Cir. 2021). Next, Mahbob did not raise her due process claim in her BIA brief. *See Monteon-Camargo v. Barr*, 918 F.3d 423, 429 (5th Cir. 2019). The Government is correct that Mahbob's arguments are unexhausted. *See Santos-Zacaria v. Garland*, 598 U.S. 411, 413 (2023). Because the Government raises exhaustion, we will enforce the exhaustion claim-processing rule and decline to consider the claims. *See Carreon v. Garland*, 71 F.4th 247, 257 (5th Cir. 2023). Thus, we need not address the Government's remaining arguments. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976).

The petition for review is DENIED.