

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-1785

ILESANMI ODUNWOLE LAROJA,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A76-588-504)

Submitted: June 19, 2003

Decided: July 8, 2003

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joshua A. Moses, JOSHUA MOSES & ASSOCIATES, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Robert D. McCallum, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Mary Jane Candaux, Senior Litigation Counsel, Audrey B. Hemesath, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Ilesanmi Odunwole Laroja, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions for review of a final order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming without opinion the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of asylum and withholding of removal.

Laroja challenges the IJ's negative credibility finding, asserting that the IJ misunderstood his testimony, placed too much weight on minor inconsistencies, and that the IJ's findings were contrary to the evidence in the record. We have thoroughly reviewed the record in light of the IJ's findings and conclude that Laroja's assertions are without merit. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4) (2000); Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 323 (4th Cir. 2002); Matter of S-A-, Int. Dec. 3433 (BIA 2000); Matter of A-S-, 21 I. & N. Dec. 1106 (BIA 1998).

Laroja also contends that the Board abused its discretion in affirming the IJ's findings without opinion and failed to properly evaluate his appeal. As these claims are merely mentioned in Laroja's brief and are entirely undeveloped, we find that they have been abandoned. Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999).

We accordingly deny Laroja's petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED