

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1007

CHISSE TOURE,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A70-888-811)

Submitted: June 9, 2004

Decided: June 25, 2004

Before WIDENER, WILKINSON, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Randall L. Johnson, JOHNSON & ASSOCIATES, P.C., Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Mark C. Walters, Assistant Director, Victor M. Lawrence, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Chisse Toure, a native of the Ivory Coast and a citizen of Mali, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming without opinion the Immigration Judge's (IJ) decision to deny asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the petition for review.

Toure disputes the IJ's conclusion that she was firmly resettled in the Ivory Coast and lacked a well-founded fear of persecution in Mali. To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence 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 Toure fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. See Mussie v. INS, 172 F.3d 329, 331-32 (4th Cir. 1999); Huaman-Cornelio v. Board of Immigration Appeals, 979 F.2d 995, 999 (4th Cir. 1992). Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that she seeks.

Additionally, we reject Toure's contention that the Board's summary affirmance of the IJ's decision violated her rights under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. See Blanco de Belbruno v. Ashcroft, 362 F.3d 272, 280-83 (4th Cir. 2004).

We therefore 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