**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

HENRIETTA LEANA NICOL,
Petitioner,

v.

No. 96-1810

U.S. IMMIGRATION&
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order
of the Board of Immigration Appeals.
(A71-795-237)

Submitted: March 31, 1997

Decided: April 25, 1997

Before HALL and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges,
and PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Randall L. Johnson, Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Frank W. Hunger, Assistant Attorney General, David V. Bernal, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jane R. Gomez, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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).

---

**OPINION**

PER CURIAM:

Henrietta Leana Nicol petitions for review of a final order of the Board of Immigration Appeals denying her application for asylum and withholding of deportation. We deny the petition.

Nicol challenges the Immigration Judge's finding that she was not credible based upon inconsistencies between her testimony and the information she supplied in two applications for asylum. An Immigration Judge's credibility determination is to be granted substantial deference and is reviewed under a substantial evidence standard. See Figeroa v. INS, 886 F.2d 76, 78 (4th Cir. 1989) (stating that Immigration Judge who rejects a witness' positive testimony based on a lack of credibility should offer specific reasons for disbelief). In Nicol's case, the Immigration Judge offered several concrete examples of contradictions noted between Nicol's testimony and her asylum applications which led to his conclusion that her testimony was not credible. Nicol concedes these inconsistencies, but argues that she explained them and that the Immigration Judge's determination that she was not credible on the basis of these inconsistencies was a "misinterpretation of the facts and law." In support of this argument, Nicol cites to two Ninth Circuit cases: Platero-Cortez v. INS, 804 F.2d 1127 (9th Cir. 1986), and Damaize-Job v. INS, 787 F.2d 1332 (9th Cir. 1986). We find these cases to be distinguishable from Nicol's factual situation, and therefore unconvincing. Accordingly, we find no reason to reverse either the Immigration Judge's finding that Nicol was not credible or his subsequent denial of her request for asylum on that basis. We therefore deny Nicol's petition. 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