**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-1830**

---

YOHANNES BEKELE KORCHA; YETIMWORK LEMMA KABTYIMER,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

---

Submitted: March 15, 2012 Decided: April 6, 2012

---

Before DUNCAN, DAVIS, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alan M. Parra, LAW OFFICES OF ALAN M. PARRA, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioners. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Holly M. Smith, Senior Litigation Counsel, Joseph D. Hardy, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Office of Immigration Litigation, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yohannes Bekele Korcha and Yetimwork Lemma Kabtyimer, both natives and citizens of Ethiopia, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming the Immigration Judge's denial of Korcha's applications for relief from removal.

Petitioners challenge the determination that the lead applicant, Korcha, 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 Petitioners' contentions on appeal and conclude that the agency's decision is supported by substantial evidence. Petitioners thus fail to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Korcha 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).

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