

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1669

VAKHOB VALIYEVICH ABDULLAYEV,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: January 13, 2010

Decided: January 27, 2010

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Vakhab Valiyevich Abdullayev, Petitioner Pro Se. George William Maugans, III, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland; William Charles Peachey, Tyrone Sojourner, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Vakhob Valiyevich Abdullayev, a native and citizen of Uzbekistan, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming the Immigration Judge's denial of his applications for relief from removal.

Abdullayev first challenges the determination that he 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 Abdullayev fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Having failed to qualify for asylum, Abdullayev 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). Finally, we uphold the finding below that Abdullayev failed to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that he would be tortured if removed to Uzbekistan. 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2009).

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