

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-1245**

---

ABDOURAHAMAN KABA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: July 7, 2008

Decided: August 18, 2008

---

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sopo Ngwa, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Acting Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Assistant Director, Jason S. Patil, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Abdourahaman Kaba, a native and citizen of Guinea, filed a petition for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board") order dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's order denying his applications for asylum, withholding from removal and withholding under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We deny the petition for review.

The Immigration and Naturalization Act ("INA") authorizes the Attorney General to confer asylum on any refugee. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a) (2000). The INA defines a refugee as a person unwilling or unable to return to his native country "because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42)(A) (2000). An applicant can establish refugee status based on past persecution in his native country on account of a protected ground. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(b)(1) (2006). Without regard to past persecution, an alien can establish a well-founded fear of persecution on a protected ground. Ngaruruh v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 187 (4th Cir. 2004).

An applicant has the burden of demonstrating his eligibility for asylum. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(a) (2006); Gandziami-Mickhou v. Gonzales, 445 F.3d 351, 353 (4th Cir. 2006). A determination regarding eligibility for asylum is affirmed if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a

whole. INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Credibility findings are reviewed for substantial evidence. A trier of fact who rejects an applicant's testimony on credibility grounds must offer "specific, cogent reason[s]" for doing so. Figeroa v. INS, 886 F.2d 76, 78 (4th Cir. 1989). "Examples of specific and cogent reasons include inconsistent statements, contradictory evidence, and inherently improbable testimony . . . ." Tewabe v. Gonzales, 446 F.3d 533, 538 (4th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). This court accords broad, though not unlimited, deference to credibility findings supported by substantial evidence. Camara v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 361, 367 (4th Cir. 2004). This court will reverse the Board "only if the evidence presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 325 n.14 (4th Cir. 2002) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

We find substantial evidence supports the Board's finding that the immigration judge's adverse credibility finding was not clearly erroneous. The record does not compel a different result. Accordingly, we will not disturb the Board's denial of Kaba's applications for asylum and withholding from removal.\*

---

\*Kaba does not challenge the Board's denial of his application for withholding under the CAT.

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