UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1959

XUEBIN CHEN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: October 20, 2010 Decided: November 2, 2010

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Vincent Wong, LAW OFFICES OF VINCENT S. WONG, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Hogan, Senior Litigation Counsel, Nicole John S. J. Thomas-Dorris, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Xuebin Chen, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the Immigration Judge's denial of his applications for relief from removal.

Chen first challenges the determination that he 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." <u>INS v. Elias-Zacarias</u>, 502 U.S. 478, 483-84 (1992). We have reviewed the evidence of record and conclude that Chen fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result.

Having failed to qualify for asylum, Chen cannot meet the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. <u>Chen v.</u> <u>INS</u>, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999); <u>INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca</u>, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). Finally, we uphold the finding below that Chen failed to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that he would be tortured if removed to China. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2010).

We accordingly deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

2

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED