

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-2058

CHARLES BOBGA NJINJOH,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: May 21, 2008

Decided: June 12, 2008

Before MICHAEL, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Danielle L.C. Beach-Oswald, Min G. Kang, BEACH-OSWALD IMMIGRATION LAW ASSOC., PC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Acting Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Jessie K. Liu, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Bobga Njinjoh, a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals adopting and affirming the Immigration Judge's denial of his applications for relief from removal.

Njinjoh first challenges the determination that he failed to establish eligibility for asylum. 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 Njinjoh fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Njinjoh 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 below that Njinjoh failed to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that he would be tortured if removed to Cameroon. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2008).

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