

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1248

CHRISTINE BOATENG-WALKER,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: January 19, 2011

Decided: February 16, 2011

Before SHEDD, DAVIS, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Arnedo S. Valera, LAW OFFICES OF VALERA & ASSOCIATES, Fairfax, Virginia, for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Jennifer Levings, Senior Litigation Counsel, Monica G. Antoun, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christine Boateng-Walker, a native and citizen of Ghana, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") affirming the immigration judge's denial of her request for withholding of removal. "To qualify for withholding of removal, a petitioner must show that [s]he faces a clear probability of persecution because of [her] race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 324 n.13 (4th Cir. 2002) (citing INS v. Stevic, 467 U.S. 407, 430 (1984)); see 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3)(A) (2006); 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(b) (2010). Boateng-Walker challenges the determination that her testimony was not credible, and that she otherwise failed to meet her burden of proof for withholding of removal.

Administrative findings of fact are conclusive unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to decide to the contrary. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2006). We accord broad, though not unlimited, deference to credibility findings supported by substantial evidence. Camara v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 361, 367 (4th Cir. 2004). We will uphold the final agency determination if it is "not manifestly contrary to law." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted).

Based on our review of the record and the decisions of both the immigration judge and the Board, we conclude that

substantial evidence supports the Board's determination that Boateng-Walker failed to establish her entitlement to withholding of removal. 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