

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2231

TIZITA ADDIS MAMMO,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A79-469-266)

Submitted: March 10, 2004

Decided: March 29, 2004

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Aragaw Mehari, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Linda S. Wendtland, Assistant Director, John C. Cunningham, Senior Litigation Counsel, Civil Division, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Tizita Addis Mammo, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming without opinion the immigration judge's denial of her applications for asylum and withholding of removal. On appeal, Mammo challenges the immigration judge's ruling that Mammo failed to establish her eligibility for asylum. To obtain reversal of a determination denying asylum, 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 Mammo's evidence does not compel a contrary result.

In addition, we uphold the immigration judge's denial of Mammo's application for withholding of removal. To qualify for withholding, an applicant must demonstrate "a clear probability of persecution" on a protected ground. INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430-31 (1987). Based on our review of the record, we find that Mammo has failed to meet this standard.

Accordingly, we deny a 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