

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-1456**

---

ZHIQIANG WANG,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., U.S. Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: January 27, 2012

Decided: February 2, 2012

---

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jim Li, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Tony West Assistant Attorney General, Derek C. Julius, Senior Litigation Counsel, Katherine A. Smith, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Zhiqiang Wang, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) denying Wang's motion to remand and dismissing his appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of his applications for relief from removal.

Wang 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 Wang's claims and conclude that Wang fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Wang 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 conclude based on our review that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying Wang's motion to remand. See Hussain v. Gonzales, 477 F.3d 153, 155 (4th Cir. 2007).

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