

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1253

LIANG CHEN,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: January 9, 2009

Decided: January 21, 2009

Before TRAXLER, SHEDD, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Liang Chen, Petitioner Pro Se. Daniel Eric Goldman, Senior Litigation Counsel, Eric Warren Marsteller, Jem Colleen Sponzo, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Liang Chen, who claims to be a native and citizen of the People's Republic of China, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

Chen first challenges the determination that he failed to establish his 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. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that he seeks.

Additionally, we uphold the denial of Chen'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 Chen failed to show

that he is eligible for asylum, he 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

* In his informal brief before this court, Chen has failed to raise any challenges to the denial of his request for protection under the Convention Against Torture. We therefore find that he has waived appellate review of this claim. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("The Court will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief."); Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004).