

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 07-2006**

---

LI RONG LIU,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

**No. 07-2086**

---

LI RONG LIU,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals.

---

Submitted: July 2, 2008

Decided: August 8, 2008

---

Before KING, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Vincent Wong, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Carol Federighi, Senior Litigation Counsel, Rebecca Hoffberg, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Li Rong Liu, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's decision, which denied her request for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

Liu does not challenge the Board's adoption of the immigration judge's finding that she failed to show that her asylum application was timely filed. Furthermore, she has raised no specific claim regarding the Convention Against Torture. Therefore, these claims are abandoned. Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) (holding failure to raise specific issue in opening brief constitutes abandonment of that issue under Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A)).

Liu also contends the Board and the immigration judge erred in denying her request 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)); see 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(b) (2007). Based on our review of the record, we find that Liu failed to make the requisite showing. We therefore uphold the denial of her request for withholding of removal.

Accordingly, we deny Liu's 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