

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1364

FERDINAND KAMDEM FOTSO,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A78-603-118)

Submitted: January 26, 2005

Decided: February 8, 2005

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph L.T. Tibui, LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH L.T. TIBUI, Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Richard M. Evans, Assistant Director, Nancy E. Friedman, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Ferdinand Kamdem Fotso, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming, without opinion, the immigration judge's (IJ) denial of his application for asylum.

Because the Board affirmed under its streamlined process, the IJ's decision is the final agency determination. Camara v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 361, 366 (4th Cir. 2004). We will reverse this decision 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 INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483-84 (1992)). We have reviewed the administrative record and the IJ's decision and find substantial evidence supports the conclusion that Fotso 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) (2004) (stating that the burden of proof is on the alien to establish eligibility for asylum); Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. at 483 (same).

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