

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-2233

GUO JUAN LIN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: November 24, 2009

Decided: January 12, 2010

Before KING and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and John Preston BAILEY, Chief United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia, sitting by designation.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kim-Bun Thomas Li, LI, LATSEY & GUITERMAN, PLLC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Michael F. Hertz, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division, Jennifer L. Lightbody, Senior Litigation Counsel, Achiezer Guggenheim, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Office of Immigration Litigation, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Guo Juan Lin, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the September 29, 2008, order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA"). In that order, the BIA dismissed in part Lin's appeal from the Immigration Judge's ("IJ") May 22, 2006, decision, concluding that the IJ did not err in finding that she failed to meet her burden of proof for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). The BIA also denied Lin's motion to remand her case to the IJ for further consideration of evidence that was not submitted during her hearing before the IJ. Finally, the BIA remanded the case for the limited purpose of providing the IJ the opportunity to identify the country to which Lin's removal may be made.

In support of her petition for review, Lin contends that the BIA erred by dismissing her asylum, withholding of removal, and CAT claims because she established that she has suffered past persecution and has a well-founded fear of future persecution. She also contends that the BIA erred by denying her motion to remand and that it violated her right to due process and equal protection.

We have carefully reviewed the administrative record and the parties' briefs. We find that Lin has offered insufficient evidence to establish that she suffered past persecution or has

a well-founded fear of future persecution. Accordingly, we find no error in the BIA's decision, and 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