

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1429

PATRICK KAMGANG,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A95-905-707)

Submitted: December 12, 2005

Decided: December 28, 2005

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

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jacqueline E. Ngole, Rockville, Maryland, for Petitioner. Jonathan S. Gasser, United States Attorney, Marvin J. Caughman, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Patrick Kamgang, 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 applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence 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 Kamgang fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Kamgang cannot meet the higher standard to qualify for withholding of removal. Chen v. INS, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999); INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). In addition, we uphold the IJ's finding that Kamgang failed to establish that it was more likely than not that he would be tortured if removed to Cameroon. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2005). Finally, in light of the above conclusions, we reject Kamgang's claim that the Board violated immigration regulations in using the affirmance without opinion procedure in this case.

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