

United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

No. 25-60537
Summary Calendar

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 28, 2026

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

AHTESHAM TARIQ,

Petitioner,

versus

TODD WALLACE BLANCHE, *Acting U.S. Attorney General,*

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
Agency No. A200 841 000

Before WIENER, WILLETT, and WILSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff-Appellant Ahtesham Tariq, a native and citizen of Pakistan, petitions for review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) dismissing his appeal from an order of an immigration judge denying asylum, withholding of removal, protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT), and adjustment of status. Tariq has abandoned any challenge to the

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

No. 25-60537

denial of adjustment of status. *See Soadjede v. Ashcroft*, 324 F.3d 830, 833 (5th Cir. 2003).

Tariq's challenge to the BIA's adverse credibility determination is unavailing because the adverse credibility determination was supported by specific and cogent reasons based on the record, and he fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. *See Avelar-Oliva v. Barr*, 954 F.3d 757, 763-64 (5th Cir. 2020). The adverse credibility determination is dispositive of his claims for asylum, humanitarian asylum, and withholding of removal. *See Arulnanthy v. Garland*, 17 F.4th 586, 597 (5th Cir. 2021); *Dayo v. Holder*, 687 F.3d 653, 658-59 (5th Cir. 2012). We therefore will not address Tariq's remaining arguments concerning those forms of relief. *See INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976).

Tariq's argument that his "objective" documentary evidence showed the requisite state action for deferral of removal under the CAT is likewise unavailing. His documents do not compel the conclusion that officials would acquiesce to any torture. *See Martinez Manzanares v. Barr*, 925 F.3d 222, 228 (5th Cir. 2019); *Chen v. Gonzales*, 470 F.3d 1131, 1134 (5th Cir. 2006). Further, while he cites country conditions evidence from his expert's report, such information is too general to independently compel the conclusion that sufficient state action would be involved in any likely torture that he would suffer. *See Morales v. Sessions*, 860 F.3d 812, 818 (5th Cir. 2017). We therefore will not address the parties' remaining arguments whether the agency erred in determining that Tariq was statutorily barred from withholding of removal under the CAT under the terrorism bar. *See Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. at 25.

The petition for review is DENIED.