

UNPUBLISHED  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

HAYAT MAHMOUD OMAR, <i>Petitioner,</i>
v.
JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General, <i>Respondent.</i>

No. 03-1188

On Petition for Review of an Order  
of the Board of Immigration Appeals.  
(A78-355-535)

Submitted: October 8, 2003

Decided: October 23, 2003

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and TRAXLER,  
Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Hayat Mahmoud Omar, Petitioner Pro Se. Emily Anne Radford,  
Joshua Eric Terrence Braunstein, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT  
OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

**OPINION**

## PER CURIAM:

Hayat Mahmoud Omar, a native and citizen of Eritrea, 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, Omar first 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 Omar fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that Omar seeks.

Omar also contends that the Board failed to provide a comprehensible reason for its decision in affirming the decision of the immigration judge without opinion, after review by a single Board member, in accordance with the procedure set out at 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(e)(4) (2003). We find that by explicitly adopting the immigration judge's decision as the agency's final determination, the Board has fulfilled the requirement of providing a reasoned basis for its decision. *Cf. Gandarilla-Zambrana v. Bd. of Immigration Appeals*, 44 F.3d 1251, 1255 (4th Cir. 1995) (upholding the Board's practice of adopting, without further explanation, the reasoning of the immigration judge and stating that the immigration judge's decision then becomes the sole basis for this court's review).

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*