

UNPUBLISHED

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

SOLANGE AMOUGOU MBEDE,
Petitioner,
v.
JOHN ASHCROFT,
Respondent.

No. 02-2293

On Petition for Review of an Order
of the Board of Immigration Appeals.
(A77-249-578)

Submitted: October 29, 2003

Decided: November 24, 2003

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Denise A. Maniscalco, MANISCALCO LAW FIRM, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Margaret Perry, Senior Litigation Counsel, Mary Jane Candaux, Senior Litigation Counsel, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Solange Amougou Mbede, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming without opinion the immigration judge's (IJ's) denial of asylum and withholding of removal. Mbede asserts that she provided detailed, consistent and plausible testimony sufficient to support her claim that she was eligible for asylum. *See* 8 U.S.C.A. § 1158 (West 1999 & Supp. 2003); 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42)(A) (2000). We have reviewed the record, the IJ's decision, and the Board's conclusion, and find that substantial evidence supports the IJ in her ruling that Mbede failed to establish refugee status. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4) (2000); *see Matter of Y-B-*, 21 I. & N. Dec. 1136, 1139 (BIA 1998); *Matter of S-M-J-*, 21 I. & N. Dec. 722, 724-26 (BIA 1997).*

Mbede challenges the adequacy of the Board's review of her appeal, arguing that the Board did not clearly state its reasoning. We reject her challenge, as the Board complied with the summary affirmation procedures set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(e)(4) (2003). *See Khattak v. Ashcroft*, 332 F.3d 250, 253 (4th Cir.) ("Khattak already has received a full explanation of the immigration judge's decision, which is essentially the decision under review."), *petition for cert. filed*, ___ U.S.L.W. ___ (U.S. Sept. 11, 2003) (No. 03-521). 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

*Mbede seeks to challenge the IJ's denial of her request for withholding of removal. As she failed to raise this issue before the Board, Mbede has waived her right to assert the claim in this Court. *Farrokhi v. INS*, 900 F.2d 697, 700 (4th Cir. 1990).