

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-1231**

---

KHADRA SHEIK AHMED MOHAMED,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A76-419-457)

---

Submitted: August 19, 2003

Decided: September 17, 2003

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Larry L. Lewis, LAW OFFICES OF J.W. NESARI, L.L.C., Herndon, Virginia, for Petitioner. Robert D. McCallum, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Jeffrey J. Bernstein, Senior Litigation Counsel, Michael T. Dougherty, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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).

PER CURIAM:

Khadra Sheik Ahmed Mohamed, a native and citizen of Somalia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming without opinion the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and for relief under the Convention Against Torture.

Mohamed takes issue with the IJ's negative credibility finding. She contends that she qualifies for relief even assuming that her claim of rape is false and maintains that the rape was not central to her claim. She further asserts that the credibility determination was in error because the IJ failed to take cultural considerations into account, she provided a reasonable explanation for the discrepancy on the rape claim, and the evidence in fact supports her rape claim.

We have thoroughly reviewed the record in light of the IJ's findings and conclude that Mohamed's assertions are without merit. As the negative credibility determination is supported by the record and is entitled to deference, Mohamed does not qualify for the relief sought. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4) (2000); see Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 323 (4th Cir. 2002); Matter of S-A-, Int. Dec. 3433 (BIA 2000); Matter of A-S-, 21 I. & N. Dec. 1106 (BIA 1998).

We accordingly 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