

FILED

July 12, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

No. 05-60434
Summary Calendar

BADAR SIDDIQI,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A78 551 899

Before BARKSDALE, STEWART and CLEMENT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Badar Siddiqi petitions this court for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals's (BIA) decision denying asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT). As to his asylum application, Siddiqi seeks to challenge the BIA's determination that his application was untimely under 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(2)(B). This court lacks jurisdiction to

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

review the BIA's determination that Siddiqi's asylum application was untimely. *See* § 1158(a)(3). The petition for review is thus DISMISSED as to the asylum claim.

Siddiqi argues that the BIA erred in denying his application for withholding of removal. Siddiqi fails to demonstrate that the alleged isolated incidents of mistreatment or his status as a young, male Muhajir establish a "clear probability" that he would be persecuted upon his return to Pakistan. This court has held that similar allegations of mistreatment do not rise to the level of persecution. *See, e.g., Abdel-Masieh v. INS*, 73 F.3d 579, 584 (5th Cir. 1996); *Fleurinor v. INS*, 585 F.2d 129, 132 (5th Cir. 1978). Because the immigration judge's findings are supported by substantial evidence and the evidence does not compel a contrary conclusion, the petition for review is DENIED. *See Carbajal-Gonzalez v. INS*, 78 F.3d 194, 197 (5th Cir. 1996); *Chun v. INS*, 40 F.3d 76, 78 (5th Cir. 1994).

Siddiqi does not brief the BIA's denial of relief under the CAT. Accordingly, Siddiqi has waived the claim. *See Rodriguez v. INS*, 9 F.3d 408, 414 n.15 (5th Cir. 1993).

PETITION DISMISSED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.