

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 08-1457

---

BIRTUKAN GEBREMARIAM MESHESHA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: December 17, 2008

Decided: February 9, 2009

---

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jason A. Dzubow, MENSAH, BUTLER & DZUBOW, PLLC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Gregory G. Katsas, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Emily Anne Radford, Senior Litigation Counsel, Margaret A. O'Donnell, Trial Attorney, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Birtukan Gebremariam Meshesha, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, 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.

Before this court, Meshesha 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 Meshesha fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Accordingly, we cannot grant the relief that she seeks.

We therefore deny the petition for review.\* We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

---

\* Meshesha fails to challenge the denial of her requests for withholding of removal or protection under the Convention Against Torture. She has therefore waived appellate review of these claims. See Ngarurih v. Ashcroft, 371 F.3d 182, 189 n.7 (4th Cir. 2004) (finding that failure to raise a challenge in an opening brief results in abandonment of that challenge); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) (same).

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED