UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1985

MAHNAZ ARSHAD, a/k/a Mohammed Zubair,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General of the United States,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A77-977-268)

Submitted: January 31, 2006 Decided: February 16, 2006

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert A. Remes, CARLINER & REMES, P.C., Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Christopher J. Gramiccioni, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Mahnaz Arshad, a native and citizen of Pakistan, petitions for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") order dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We deny the petition for review.

Arshad bore the burden of demonstrating his eligibility for asylum. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(a) (2005); Gonahasa v. INS, 181 F.3d 538, 541 (4th Cir. 1999). 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 by the petitioner 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)).

With respect to Arshad's claim that he was persecuted by Sunni Muslims, we find substantial evidence supports the Board's findings that he failed to show the Pakistani government was unwilling and unable to control the extremist groups.

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