

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-1574**

---

NEGUSSU DEMISSIE; KIRUBEL NEGUSSU,

Petitioners,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (A76-419-153; A76-419-154)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2004

Decided: March 9, 2004

---

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Thomas Hutchins, IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE APPELLATE CENTER, LLC, Alexandria, Virginia, for Petitioners. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, David V. Bernal, Assistant Director, Colette J. Winston, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Petitioners Negussu Demissie ("Demissie") and Kirubel Negussu ("Negussu"), natives and citizens of Ethiopia, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing their appeal from the immigration judge's order denying their applications for asylum and withholding of removal. Demissie is the primary applicant for asylum; the claims of his son, Negussu, are derivative of his application. See 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(3) (2000); 8 C.F.R. § 1208.21(a) (2003).

Rather than challenging the merits of the Board's decision on appeal, the Petitioners contend that the Board erroneously failed to address one of their issues, testimony, and much documentation of record, in violation of their due process rights. We have reviewed this challenge and find it to be without merit. As we have previously stated, the "Board need not . . . 'write an exegesis on every contention. What is required is merely that it consider the issues raised and announce its decision in terms sufficient to enable a reviewing court to perceive that it has heard and thought and not merely reacted.'" Casalena v. INS, 984 F.2d 105, 107 (4th Cir. 1993) (citing Becerra-Jiminez v. INS, 829 F.2d 996, 1000 (10th Cir. 1987)). We find the Board's opinion to be more than adequate to satisfy due process.

We therefore 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