

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1635

NICOLE NGAMLIA TANGWA,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A95-254-484)

Submitted: November 18, 2005

Decided: December 27, 2005

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph L. T. Tibui, LAW OFFICES OF JOSEPH L. T. TIBUI, Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Paul J. McNulty, United States Attorney, Brian E. Bentley, Special Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Nicole Ngamlia Tangwa, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") order affirming without opinion the immigration judge's decision to deny her applications for asylum and withholding from removal.* We deny the petition for review.

A determination regarding eligibility for asylum or withholding of removal is conclusive if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole. INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Administrative findings of fact are conclusive unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to decide to the contrary. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2000). We will reverse the Board "only if 'the evidence presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution.'" Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 325 n.14 (4th Cir. 2002) (quoting Huaman-Cornelio, 979 F.2d at 999 (internal quotation marks omitted)). We find the immigration judge's negative credibility finding was supported by substantial evidence. We further find the evidence was not so compelling as to warrant reversal.

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

*Tangwa does not challenge the denial of relief under the Convention Against Torture.

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED