

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-2155

HAI YING CHEN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: November 17, 2009

Decided: December 3, 2009

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gary J. Yerman, YERMAN & ASSOCIATES, LLC, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Jeffrey S. Bucholtz, Acting Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Jonathan Robbins, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Office of Immigration Litigation, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Hai Ying Chen, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming the Immigration Judge's denial of her applications for relief from removal, and denying her motion to remand.

Chen challenges the determination that she 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 Chen fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Chen 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). Next, we uphold the finding below that Chen did not demonstrate eligibility for protection under the Convention Against Torture. See 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2), (3) (2009). Finally, we have reviewed Chen's claims and conclude that the Board did not abuse its discretion in denying her motion to remand. See Onyeme v. INS, 146 F.3d 227, 234 (4th Cir. 1998).

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