

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1075

MISTIR HAILU,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, U. S. Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A72-379-828)

Submitted: March 9, 2007

Decided: March 28, 2007

Before WILKINSON and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

René E. Browne, Michaelynn R. Ware, HOGAN & HARTSON, L.L.P., Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, James Hunolt, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Sara Ann Ketchum, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mistir Hailu, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals adopting and affirming the immigration judge's order on remand denying her requests for asylum and withholding of removal. In her petition for review, Hailu challenges the immigration judge's determination that she failed to establish her eligibility for asylum. To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence [she] 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 Hailu fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that she seeks.

Because Hailu failed to establish that she had a well-founded fear of persecution, she cannot meet the higher standard required for withholding of removal as set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3) (2000). See Camara v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 361, 367 (4th Cir. 2004). Since substantial evidence supports the conclusion that Hailu is ineligible for asylum, she likewise fails to qualify 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