

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

AFEWORK ABERA, a/k/a Erassa
Afework Abera, a/k/a Sami
Moulegeta,

Petitioner,

v.

U.S. IMMIGRATION & NATURALIZATION
SERVICE; JOHN ASHCROFT,

Respondents.

No. 02-2206

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals.
(A79-235-695)

Submitted: April 3, 2003

Decided: April 11, 2003

Before WILKINSON and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Afework Abera, Petitioner Pro Se. James Arthur Hunolt, Emily Anne Radford, Paul Fiorino, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondents.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Afewerk Abera, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") affirming without opinion the immigration judge's order denying his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture.

The decision to grant or deny asylum relief is conclusive "unless manifestly contrary to the law and an abuse of discretion." 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(D) (2000). We conclude that the record supports the immigration judge's conclusion that Abera failed to establish his eligibility for asylum. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(a) (2002); *Gonahasa v. INS*, 181 F.3d 538, 541 (4th Cir. 1999). As the decision in this case is not manifestly contrary to law, we cannot grant the relief Abera seeks.

Additionally, we find Abera's challenges to the Board's use of the streamlined review procedure set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 3.1(a)(7) (2002) to be without merit. *See Gonzalez-Oropeza v. United States Attorney Gen.*, 321 F.3d 1331, 1333-34 (11th Cir. 2003); *Albathani v. INS*, 318 F.3d 365, 375-79 (1st Cir. 2003). We further find that summary affirmance was appropriate in this case under the factors set forth in § 3.1(a)(7)(ii).

Accordingly, we deny Abera's petition for review. We deny his motion to expedite the case as moot. 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