

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 07-2001

---

AYNALEM MARKETY JINO,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

---

Submitted: May 19, 2008

Decided: July 10, 2008

---

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

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alan M. Parra, LAW OFFICE OF ALAN M. PARRA, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Acting Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Brianne Whelan Cohen, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Aynalem Markety Jino, 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 denial of her applications for relief from removal.

Jino first challenges the determination that she failed to establish 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 Jino fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Jino cannot meet the more stringent standard 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). Finally, we uphold the finding below that Jino failed to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that she would be tortured if removed to Ethiopia. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2008).

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