

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1787

ROSE BOKENG NKWANYUO,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A98-602-491)

Submitted: April 14, 2008

Decided: May 6, 2008

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Oti W. Nwosu, THE LAW OFFICE OF OTI W. NWOSU, Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Francis W. Fraser, Senior Litigation Counsel, Gary J. Newkirk, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rose Bokeng Nkwanyuo, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals adopting and affirming the Immigration Judge's denial of her applications for relief from removal.

Nkwanyuo first challenges the determination that she failed to establish eligibility for asylum. 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 Nkwanyuo fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Nkwanyuo cannot meet the more stringent standard 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). Finally, we uphold the finding below that Nkwanyuo failed to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that she would be tortured if removed to Cameroon. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2007).

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