

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1859

FANTU A. KERKERO,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A96-281-611)

Submitted: April 18, 2007

Decided: May 1, 2007

Before MOTZ, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Solomon Bekele, LAW OFFICES OF SOLOMON & ASSOCIATES, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Larry D. Adams, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Fantu A. Kerkerero, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming without opinion the Immigration Judge's denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

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 Kerkerero fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to establish eligibility for asylum, Kerkerero cannot meet the higher standard to qualify for withholding of removal. Chen v. INS, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999); INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987). Finally, our review discloses that Kerkerero did not show eligibility for CAT relief because she did not demonstrate that it is more likely than not that she will be tortured if removed to Ethiopia. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2006).

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