

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-2320

LIQIN SHI, a/k/a Li Qin Shi,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General, United States
Department of Justice,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: July 17, 2012

Decided: August 14, 2012

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yee Ling Poon, Robert Duk-Hwan Kim, LAW OFFICE OF YEE LING POON,
LLC, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Stuart F. Delery,
Acting Assistant Attorney General, Jennifer P. Levings, Senior
Litigation Counsel, Tim Ramnitz, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

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

Shi 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 Shi's claims and conclude that Shi fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Shi 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 Shi'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