

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-2768

Alida Malaj,

Petitioner,

v.

Alberto Gonzales, Attorney General
of the United States,

Respondent.

*
*
*
* Petition for Review of an
* Order of the Board of
* Immigration Appeals.
*
* [UNPUBLISHED]
*
*

Submitted: July 7, 2006
Filed: July 12, 2006

Before ARNOLD, BYE, and SMITH, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Alida Malaj, an Albanian citizen, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA), which affirmed an Immigration Judge's (IJ's) denial of asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). We deny the petition. See Eta-Ndu v. Gonzales, 411 F.3d 977, 982-83 (8th Cir. 2005) (standard of review).

When an asylum decision is based on an adverse credibility finding, as it was in this case, we generally defer to the IJ if the credibility finding is supported by

“specific, cogent reasons for disbelief.” See id. at 982. Upon careful review, we conclude that the IJ provided such reasons.

We also conclude that Malaj failed to establish a well-founded fear of future persecution. See Kondakova v. Ashcroft, 383 F.3d 792, 798 (8th Cir. 2004) (applicant must genuinely fear persecution and offer credible, specific evidence that reasonable person in her position would fear persecution if returned), cert. denied, 543 U.S. 1053 (2005). Malaj’s asylum claim thus fails, and her claim for withholding of removal--which carries a more stringent burden of proof--necessarily fails as well. See Eta-Ndu, 411 F.3d at 986. To the extent her CAT claim is reviewable, we agree with the BIA that Malaj presented no separate facts supporting CAT relief. See Rodriguez v. Gonzales, 441 F.3d 593, 595 (8th Cir. 2006).

Malaj’s remaining arguments provide no basis for granting her petition for review, and accordingly we deny it.
