

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1112

CHANTALE TETA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: October 1, 2008

Decided: November 3, 2008

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Danielle L. C. Beach-Oswald, BEACH-OSWALD IMMIGRATION LAW ASSOCIATES, PC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Carol Federighi, Senior Litigation Counsel, Yamileth G. HandUber, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Chantale Teta, a native and citizen of Cameroon, 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.

Teta 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 Teta fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Teta 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 Teta failed to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that she would be tortured if removed to Cameroon. 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