

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2101

IDIL HASSAN ALEEL,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General of the United
States,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration
Appeals. (A78-342-989)

Submitted: June 23, 2004

Decided: July 6, 2004

Before WIDENER and WILKINSON, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Idil Hassan Aleel, Petitioner Pro Se. Richard Michael Evans, Emily
Anne Radford, Papu Sandhu, Aviva L. Poczter, Paul Fiorino, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Idil Hassan Aleel, a native and citizen of Somalia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") affirming, without opinion, the immigration judge's order denying her applications for asylum and withholding of removal.

In her petition for review, Aleel challenges the immigration judge's determination that she failed to establish her eligibility for asylum. To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence [s]he presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483-84 (1992). We have reviewed the evidence of record and conclude that Aleel fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that she seeks.

Additionally, to the extent that Aleel claims that the Board's use of the summary affirmance procedure set forth in 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(e)(4) (2004) violated her rights under the Due Process Clause, we find that this claim is squarely foreclosed by our recent decision in Blanco de Belbruno v. Ashcroft, 362 F.3d 272 (4th Cir. 2004). We further find that summary affirmance was appropriate in this case under the factors set forth in § 1003.1(e)(4).

We have reviewed Aleel's remaining claims and find them to be without merit. Accordingly, 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