

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-2318

SARA ABRAM,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, U.S. Attorney General; WARREN
A. LEWIS, INS District Director,

Respondents.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration
Appeals. (A78-340-234)

Submitted: April 12, 2004

Decided: May 14, 2004

Before MICHAEL, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael M. Hadeed, Jr., BECKER, HADEED, KELLOGG & BERRY, P.C.,
Springfield, Virginia, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant
Attorney General, Terri J. Scadron, Assistant Director, Hillel R.
Smith, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for
Respondents.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Sara Abram, a citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") affirming, without opinion, the immigration judge's denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

On appeal, Abram raises challenges to the immigration judge's determination that she failed to establish her eligibility for asylum. To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence [s]he presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483-84 (1992). We have reviewed the evidence of record and conclude that Abram fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that she seeks.

Additionally, we uphold the immigration judge's denial of Abram's request for withholding of removal. The standard for withholding of removal is more stringent than that for granting asylum. Chen v. INS, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999). To qualify for withholding of removal, an applicant must demonstrate "a clear probability of persecution." INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). Because Abram fails to show that she is

eligible for asylum, she cannot meet the higher standard for withholding of removal.

Accordingly, we deny the 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