

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1816

ALEM TESFAYE KEBEDE,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN D. ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the
United States,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration
Appeals. (A79-476-407)

Submitted: February 11, 2004

Decided: February 27, 2004

Before WILKINSON, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Allan Ebert, LAW OFFICES OF ALLAN EBERT, Washington, D.C., for
Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Linda S.
Wernery, Senior Litigation Counsel, Ana Maria Kocur, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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).

PER CURIAM:

Alem Tesfaye Kebede, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, seeks review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming without opinion the immigration judge's denial of her application for asylum. We have reviewed the administrative record and the immigration judge's decision, designated by the Board as the final agency determination, and find that substantial evidence supports the immigration judge's conclusion that Kebede failed to establish the past persecution or well-founded fear of future persecution necessary to establish eligibility for asylum. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(a) (2003) (stating that the burden of proof is on the alien to establish eligibility for asylum); INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483 (1992) (same). We will reverse the Board only if the evidence "was so compelling that no reasonable fact finder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 325 n.14 (4th Cir. 2002) (quoting Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. at 483-84). We have reviewed the immigration judge's credibility determinations and find them supported by specific, cogent reasoning and therefore entitled to substantial deference. See Figeroa v. INS, 886 F.2d 76, 78 (4th Cir. 1989). Thus, the administrative record supports the immigration judge's conclusion that Kebede failed to establish her eligibility for asylum.

We deny Kebede's 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