

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-1145**

---

INDRYAS LEMMA WOLDIE,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A97-640-617)

---

Submitted: October 16, 2006

Decided: October 25, 2006

---

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Stephen T. Chema II, RITZERT & LEYTON, P.C., Fairfax, Virginia, for Petitioner. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, James A. Frederick, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Indryas Lemma Woldie, 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 decision, which denied his requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

In his petition for review, Woldie challenges the determination that he failed to establish his 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 Woldie fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that he seeks.

We therefore 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

---

\*Woldie does not challenge the denial of his requests for withholding of removal or protection under the Convention Against Torture in his petition for review. He has therefore waived appellate review of these claims. See Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999).