

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 06-16542  
Non-Argument Calendar

---

<p>FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT July 2, 2007 THOMAS K. KAHN CLERK</p>
---

BIA Nos. A97-634-732 & A97-634-733

THAIS JOSEFINA DELGADO DE TAGLIAFERRI,  
ANDREA C. TAGLIAFERRI,

Petitioners,

versus

U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

---

Petition for Review of a Decision of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

---

**(July 2, 2007)**

Before BARKETT, WILSON, and PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Thais Delgado de Tagliaferri (“Delgado”) and her daughter Andrea Tagliaferri, pro se, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) final order affirming the Immigration Judge’s denial of her claims for asylum and withholding of removal under the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) and the United Nations Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (“CAT”).

On appeal, Delgado argues that the BIA erroneously denied her application for asylum and withholding of removal and that her credible testimony establishes past persecution by the Bolivarian Circles against her and her family due to both her opposition to Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and her leadership role in a Catholic organization. Delgado also argues that the BIA erred in denying her protection under CAT.

We review de novo the legal determinations of the BIA, and factual findings are reviewed under the substantial evidence test. D-Muhumed v. U.S. Att’y Gen., 388 F.3d 814, 817 (11th Cir. 2004). Under the substantial evidence test, we affirm the BIA’s findings of fact unless the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. Farquharson v. U.S. Att’y. Gen., 246 F.3d 1317, 1320 (11th Cir. 2001).

Based upon review of the record and the briefs of the parties, we find that substantial evidence supports the BIA’s determination that Delgado failed to establish that she was entitled to asylum. Delgado did not establish that she was

qualified for asylum based on past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution. She was also unable to establish her entitlement to withholding of removal or CAT relief.

**PETITION DENIED.**