

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1103

ALAIN BLAISE ETOUNDI,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A78-586-986)

Submitted: October 22, 2003

Decided: February 10, 2004

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edwin K. Fogam, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Linda S. Wendtland, Assistant Director, John C. Cunningham, Senior Litigation Counsel, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Alain Blaise Etoundi, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming without opinion the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of asylum and withholding of removal. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the petition for review.

Etoundi asserts that his testimony was credible and corroborated and contends that he established his eligibility for asylum. 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 Etoundi fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that Etoundi seeks.

Additionally, we uphold the IJ's denial of Etoundi's application 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 Etoundi fails to show he is eligible

for asylum, he 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