

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-2386**

---

ZEWDI ARAIA,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, U.S. Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A79-092-162)

---

Submitted: June 9, 2004

Decided: August 4, 2004

---

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Rev. Uduak J. Ubom, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Richard M. Evans, Assistant Director, Susan K. Houser, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Zewdi Araia, 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 (IJ) denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the petition for review.

Araia asserts that she established her eligibility 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 Araia fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that Araia seeks.

Additionally, we uphold the IJ's denial of Araia's application for withholding of removal. 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). To qualify for withholding of removal, an applicant must demonstrate "a clear probability of persecution." INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). Because Araia fails to show 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