

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-2273**

---

HANA ABEBE BELAY,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN D. ASHCROFT, Attorney General for the  
United States,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration  
Appeals. (A79-468-657)

---

Submitted: May 17, 2004

Decided: June 3, 2004

---

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, 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Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.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, Office of  
Immigration Litigation, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Hana Abebe Belay, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, seeks review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming without opinion the immigration judge's denial of her application for asylum. We have reviewed the administrative record and the decision of the immigration judge, designated by the Board as the final agency determination, and hold that substantial evidence supports the immigration judge's conclusion that Belay failed to establish the past persecution or well-founded fear of future persecution necessary to establish eligibility for asylum. See INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992) (the burden of proof is on the alien to establish eligibility for asylum); 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(a) (2003) (same). We will reverse the Board only if the evidence "was so compelling that no reasonable fact finder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 325 n.14 (4th Cir. 2002) (quoting Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. at 483-84). We find no such compelling evidence.

We deny Belay's 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