

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-1625**

---

WILFRED MOKOKO NASAMA MUKETE,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: February 15, 2011

Decided: March 4, 2011

---

Before NIEMEYER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kevin M. Tabe, LAW OFFICES OF KEVIN M. TABE, P.C., Greenbelt, Maryland, for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Allen W. Hausman, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jeffrey J. Bernstein, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Wilfred Mokoko Nasama Mukete, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of his applications for relief from removal.

Mukete first challenges the determination that he 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 Mukete fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result.

Having failed to qualify for asylum, Mukete 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 Mukete failed to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that he would be tortured if removed to Cameroon. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2010).

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