

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 07a0151n.06

Filed: February 26, 2007

No. 06-3206

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

ELENA N. KRIVONOS; VLADIMIR I. KRIVONOS;)
DARIA B. KRIVONOS,)

Petitioners,)

v.)

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,)

Respondent.)

**ON PETITION FOR REVIEW
OF A DECISION OF THE
BOARD OF IMMIGRATION
APPEALS**

**MEMORANDUM
OPINION**

Before: NORRIS, COLE, and CLAY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM. Elena Krivonos, her husband Vladimir, and daughter Daria, who are citizens of Russia, appeal the denial by the Board of Immigration Appeals of their petition for asylum filed pursuant to § 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1158.¹ The immigration judge concluded that, even if he credited Mrs. Krivonos’ testimony,² she had failed to establish either that she suffered past persecution based upon her political activities or had a well-

¹On appeal, petitioners do not challenge the immigration judge’s denial of their request for voluntary withholding of removal under § 241(b)(3) of the INA and for withholding under the U.N. Convention Against Torture (8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)).

²The immigration judge focused exclusively upon the claims advanced by Mrs. Krivonos because she alone contends that she suffered persecution based upon political activity. Her husband and daughter’s applications are derivative of her claims.

No. 06-3206
Krivos v. Gonzales

founded fear of future persecution (or torture) upon repatriation to Russia. The BIA affirmed the denial of relief.

As with many individuals who come before us seeking permanent residency in the United States, we are sympathetic to the situation of the Krivos family and their desire to make a new life in this country. Accordingly, we have reviewed the briefs of the parties and the administrative record below with great care. We conclude that petitioners have not made the requisite showing to justify relief on any of the theories that they have advanced. Because the reasons for our decision were adequately articulated by the immigration judge in his oral decision dated August 25, 2004, and by the BIA in its January 18, 2006 order adopting and affirming that decision, a detailed opinion by this court would serve no useful purpose.

The decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals is **affirmed**.