

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-1173**

---

MING ZHONG LIN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: September 19, 2011      Decided: September 29, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Briana F. Isiminger, LAW OFFICES OF YU & ASSOCIATES, PLLC, New York, New York, for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant United States Attorney, John S. Hogan, Senior Litigation Counsel, Robbin K. Blaya, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Office of Immigration Litigation, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ming Zhong Lin, a native and citizen of China, 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.

Lin challenges the determination that he failed to establish eligibility for asylum. He first disputes the agency's adverse credibility determination. 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 the adverse credibility finding is supported by substantial evidence. Lin thus fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Additionally, we uphold the agency's finding that Lin could not in any event demonstrate past persecution based on his wife's forced sterilization, or based on "other resistance" to China's coercive population control policy. See Ni v. Holder, 613 F.3d 415, 425 (4th Cir. 2010); 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(42) (2006). Having failed to qualify for asylum, Lin 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).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We deny Lin's motion for a stay of removal and 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