**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-1810**

---

NGOZI OBIAGELI OKOYE,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A98-552-587)

---

Submitted: March 12, 2007 Decided: April 24, 2007

---

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dru Claudia Wicker, ENGLISH, LIM & WICKER, Virginia Beach, Virginia, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Michael P. Lindemann, Assistant Director, Ethan B. Kanter, Senior Litigation Counsel, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ngozi Obiageli Okoye, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) adopting and affirming the Immigration Judge's (IJ) order denying her applications for asylum and withholding of removal. Okoye disputes the IJ and Board's conclusion that she failed to meet her burden of showing that she filed her asylum application within one year of entry to the United States. We find that we are without jurisdiction to review this claim. See 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(3) (2000).

Okoye also challenges the negative credibility finding that disqualified her for withholding of removal. "To qualify for withholding of removal, a petitioner must show that he faces a clear probability of persecution because of his race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 324 n.13 (4th Cir. 2002) (citing INS v. Stevic, 467 U.S. 407, 430 (1984)). Having conducted our review, we find that substantial evidence supports the conclusion that Okoye did not set forth a credible claim.

We accordingly 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