

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1172

MEI YING LIN,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: September 24, 2008

Decided: October 8, 2008

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas V. Massucci, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Assistant Attorney General, Carol Federighi, Senior Litigation Counsel, Mona Maria Yousif, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Mei Ying Lin, a native and citizen of the People's Republic of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's denial of her requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

Lin first challenges the determination that she failed to establish her eligibility for asylum. To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence [s]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 Lin fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that she seeks.

Additionally, we uphold the denial of Lin's request for withholding of removal. "Because the burden of proof for withholding of removal is higher than for asylum--even though the facts that must be proved are the same--an applicant who is ineligible for asylum is necessarily ineligible for withholding of removal under [8 U.S.C.] § 1231(b)(3)." Camara v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 361, 367 (4th Cir. 2004). Because Lin failed to show that she is eligible for asylum, she cannot meet the higher standard for withholding of removal.

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

*Lin's brief merely recites the requirements for establishing a claim under the Convention Against Torture. She fails to raise any specific claims in this regard and has therefore waived appellate review. See Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A) ("[T]he argument . . . must contain . . . appellant's contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies."); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) ("Failure to comply with the specific dictates of [Rule 28] with respect to a particular claim triggers abandonment of that claim on appeal."); see also Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004).