

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-1543**

---

EMILIENNE MADELEINE SOBZE KENFACK, a/k/a Emilienne  
Madeleine Sobze Kenefack,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

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

---

Submitted: December 11, 2012

Decided: December 20, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Danielle L.C. Beach-Oswald, BEACH-OSWALD IMMIGRATION LAW  
ASSOCIATES, PC, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Stuart F.  
Delery, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Francis W. Fraser,  
Senior Litigation Counsel, Dawn S. Conrad, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Emilienne Madeleine Sobze Kenfack ("Sobze"), a native and citizen of Cameroon, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's denial of her requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. For the reasons set forth below, we deny the petition for review.

A determination regarding eligibility for asylum or withholding of removal is affirmed if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole. INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 481 (1992). Administrative findings of fact, including findings on credibility, are conclusive unless any reasonable adjudicator would be compelled to decide to the contrary. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B) (2006). Legal issues are reviewed de novo, "affording appropriate deference to the [Board]'s interpretation of the [Immigration and Nationality Act] and any attendant regulations." Li Fang Lin v. Mukasey, 517 F.3d 685, 691-92 (4th Cir. 2008). This court will reverse the Board only if "the evidence . . . presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. at 483-84; see Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 325 n.14 (4th Cir. 2002). Furthermore, "[t]he agency decision that an alien is not

eligible for asylum is 'conclusive unless manifestly contrary to the law and an abuse of discretion.'" Marynenka v. Holder, 592 F.3d 594, 600 (4th Cir. 2010) (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(D) (2006)).

We have reviewed the evidence of record and conclude that substantial evidence supports the adverse credibility finding. We further conclude that Sobze failed to present sufficient independent evidence of past persecution, notwithstanding the adverse credibility determination, as discussed in Camara v. Ashcroft, 378 F.3d 361, 370 (4th Cir. 2004). We therefore uphold the denial of Sobze's requests for asylum and withholding of removal. See id. at 367 ("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).").

Additionally, Sobze challenges the denial of her request for protection under the Convention Against Torture. To qualify for such protection, a petitioner bears the burden of proof of showing "it is more likely than not that he or she would be tortured if removed to the proposed country of removal." 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2012). Based on our review of the record, we conclude that substantial evidence supports

the denial of her request for relief. See Dankam v. Gonzales, 495 F.3d 113, 124 (4th Cir. 2007) (setting forth standard of review).

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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED