

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

MAHMUD GAID AHMED,

*Petitioner,*

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

*Respondent.*

No. 02-2254

On Petition for Review of an Order  
of the Board of Immigration Appeals.  
(A75-342-789)

Submitted: September 10, 2003

Decided: October 21, 2003

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

James A. Roberts, LAW OFFICES OF JAMES A. ROBERTS, Falls Church, Virginia, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Carl H. McIntyre, Jr., Senior Litigation Counsel, Marshall Tamor Golding, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

**OPINION**

## PER CURIAM:

Mahmud Gaid Ahmed, a native and citizen of Somalia, petitions for review from an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. We have reviewed the record provided by the parties and the decision of the Board.

Ahmed challenges the negative credibility findings made by the immigration judge and affirmed by the Board. We have reviewed the immigration judge's credibility determination and find it to be supported by specific, cogent reasoning and therefore entitled to substantial deference. *Figeroa v. INS*, 886 F.2d 76, 78 (4th Cir. 1989). We hold that the Board properly reviewed Ahmed's appeal under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(a)(7) (2003). Accordingly, we find Ahmed's failure to establish eligibility for asylum is not manifestly contrary to the law or an abuse of discretion. 8 U.S.C. § 1254(b)(4)(D) (2000).

The standard for receiving withholding of removal is "more stringent than that for asylum eligibility." *Chen v. INS*, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999). An applicant for withholding must demonstrate a clear probability of persecution. *INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). As Ahmed failed to establish entitlement to asylum, he cannot satisfy the higher standard for withholding of removal.

We accordingly deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*PETITION DENIED*