

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1256

ANIS SOENARYO; ASNIL AMIRUDIN GADANG; AKHDAN
GADANG; AKMAL GADANG,

Petitioners,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 06-1763

ANIS SOENARYO; ASNIL AMIRUDIN GADANG; AKHDAN
GADANG; AKMAL GADANG,

Petitioners,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petitions for Review of Orders of the Board of Immigration
Appeals. (A95-905-265; A95-905-266; A95-905-267; A95-905-268)

Submitted: March 28, 2007

Decided: April 19, 2007

Before WILLIAMS, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Haitham Edward Ballout, LAW OFFICES OF HAITHAM EDWARD BALLOUT, Burlingame, California, for Petitioners. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Barbara C. Biddle, Sushma Soni, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anis Soenaryo, and dependent petitioners Asnil Amirudin Gadang, Akhdan Gadang, and Akmal Gadang, all natives and citizens of Indonesia, petition for review of (1) an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) adopting and affirming the Immigration Judge's denial of Soenaryo's applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture, and (2) the Board's order denying her subsequent motion to reopen.

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 Soenaryo fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Soenaryo cannot meet the higher standard to qualify for withholding of removal. Chen v. INS, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999); INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). Further, she failed to demonstrate eligibility for protection under the Convention Against Torture. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2006).

In addition, our review discloses no abuse of discretion in the Board's denial of Soenaryo's motion to reopen. See INS v. Doherty, 502 U.S. 314, 323-24 (1992); Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 324 (4th Cir. 2002); Matter of Lozada, 19 I. & N. Dec. 637, 640

(B.I.A. 1988). We grant the Attorney General's motion to strike the unexhausted arguments and exhibits one through ten of Soenaryo's supplemental brief. We deny the petitions for review and 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.

PETITIONS DENIED