

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1118

CHINEDU NWOBODO AMADIFE,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: January 10, 2011 Decided: February 15, 2011

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Peter T. Ndikum, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, David V. Bernal, Assistant Director, Lindsay E. Williams, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Chinedu Nwobodo Amadife, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissing his appeal from the immigration judge's denial of his requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

Amadife 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 Amadife 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 Amadife'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

Amadife 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

* Amadife failed to raise any challenges to the denial of his request for protection under the Convention Against Torture. He has therefore waived appellate review of this claim. 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).