

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1436

AZEB YIGALEM,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A75-795-046)

Submitted: July 28, 2004

Decided: August 18, 2004

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rev. Uduak J. Ubom, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Daniel E. Goldman, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Azeb Yigalem, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing her appeal of the immigration judge's denial of her applications for asylum and withholding of removal.

On appeal, Yigalem 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 Yigalem fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief Yigalem seeks.

Additionally, we uphold the immigration judge's denial of Yigalem's request for withholding of removal. To qualify for withholding of removal, an applicant must demonstrate "a clear probability of persecution." INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430-31 (1987). 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). Because Yigalem 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