

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2085

PAMELA NEG TINONG,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A96-094-252)

Submitted: April 27, 2005

Decided: May 19, 2005

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Danielle Beach-Oswald, NOTO & OSWALD, P.C., Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Larry P. Cote, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Pamela Neg Tinong ("Tinong"), a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming the immigration judge's (IJ) denial of her application for asylum and withholding of removal. Tinong challenges the IJ's finding that she failed to present credible testimony and thus did not meet her burden of proof to qualify 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 the IJ's negative credibility findings are supported by specific, cogent reasons. Figeroa v. INS, 886 F.2d 76, 78 (4th Cir. 1989). Accordingly, Tinong fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result.

Finally, we lack jurisdiction over Tinong's challenge to the denial of her applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture because she failed to properly exhaust these claims in her appeal to the Board. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(d)(1) (2000); Asika v. Ashcroft, 362 F.3d 264, 267 n.3 (4th Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 125 S. Ct. 861 (2005).

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. Respondent's motions to strike documents in the joint appendix and to file a supplemental appendix are denied.

PETITION DENIED