

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-2153

DIEYNABA SEYDOU THIAM,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A97-637-411)

Submitted: July 18, 2007

Decided: August 15, 2007

Before MICHAEL, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kell Enow, LAW OFFICES OF ENOW AND PATCHA, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Jonathan Robbins, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dieynaba Seydou Thiam, a native and citizen of Senegal, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming the Immigration Judge's denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). Thiam challenges the Board's finding that she failed to qualify for withholding of removal and CAT relief.

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 Thiam fails to show that the evidence compels a finding that she qualified 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). In addition, we uphold the finding that Thiam failed to establish that it was more likely than not that she would be tortured if removed to Senegal. 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