

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-1240**

---

MAMIE GOLA BIZUNEH,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A96-292-283)

---

Submitted: December 18, 2006

Decided: January 16, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Aragaw Mehari, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, James A. Hunolt, Senior Litigation Counsel, Laurie Snyder, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Mamie Gola Bizuneh, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals adopting and affirming the immigration judge's denial of her requests for asylum and withholding of removal.

In her petition for review, Bizuneh challenges the immigration judge's determination that she failed to establish her 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 conclude that Bizuneh fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that she seeks.

Because Bizuneh failed to establish that she had a well-founded fear of persecution, she cannot meet the higher standard required for withholding of removal as set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(3) (2000). Camara v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 361, 367 (4th Cir. 2004). Since substantial evidence supports the conclusion that Bizuneh is ineligible for asylum, she likewise fails to qualify for withholding of removal.

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