

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1175

WILLIAM KIGGUNDU,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A77-893-088)

Submitted: April 12, 2004

Decided: June 1, 2004

Before WIDENER, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Donald L. Schlemmer, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Carl H. McIntyre, Jr., Senior Litigation Counsel, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

William Kiggundu, a native and citizen of Uganda, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") affirming, without opinion, the immigration judge's denial of his applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

On appeal, Kiggundu first claims that the immigration judge improperly discounted documentary evidence in denying his application 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 Kiggundu fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that he seeks.

Kiggundu also claims that the Board violated his due process rights in affirming the decision of the immigration judge without opinion, after review by a single Board member, in accordance with the procedure set out in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(e)(4) (2003). We have reviewed his challenges to the Board's use of this streamlined procedure and find them to be without merit. Kiggundu's argument is squarely foreclosed by our recent decision

in Blanco de Belbruno v. Ashcroft, ___ F.3d ___, 2004 WL 603501 (4th Cir. Mar. 29, 2004).

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