UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1999

IBRIAM TRAORE; SYLLA MARIAM,

                                              Petitioners,

         versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, U.S. Attorney General,

                                              Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration
Appeals. (A97-937-343; A97-937-344)

Submitted: July 18, 2007   Decided: August 9, 2007

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

M. Anne Hannigan, Chicago, Illinois, for Petitioners. Peter D.
Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, James A. Hunolt, OFFICE OF
IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Patricia L. Jannaco, UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, New York, New York, for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ibriam Traore and Sylla Mariam, both natives and citizens of Cote d'Ivoire, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of Traore's applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

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 Traore fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Traore cannot meet the more stringent standard 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, we uphold the finding that Traore failed to establish that it was more likely than not that he would be tortured if removed to Cote d'Ivoire. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2007).

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