

March 13, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III  
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 04-60941  
Summary Calendar

---

NAIM ALLMETA,

Petitioner,

versus

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

Respondent.

-----  
Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals  
BIA No. A95 903 618  
-----

Before JOLLY, DAVIS and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Naim Allmeta appeals from the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) affirming the immigration judge's (IJ) denial of his requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

Allmeta argues that the IJ erroneously concluded that he failed to establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution warranting asylum. He also argues that the case should be remanded because the IJ did not address his claim for relief under the CAT. Finally, he asks this court to extend

---

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

his grant of voluntary departure during the pendency of appellate review.

Because Allmeta has failed to show that the evidence is so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could conclude against the IJ's determination that he is not entitled to asylum, we must affirm that finding. See Carbajal-Gonzalez v. INS, 78 F.3d 194, 197 (5th Cir. 1996). Because he does not specifically challenge the IJ's denial of his request for withholding of removal, that issue is deemed abandoned. See Calderon-Ontiveros v. INS, 809 F.2d 1050, 1052 (5th Cir. 1986).

The IJ's consideration of Allmeta's CAT claim was sufficient. See Roy v. Ashcroft, 389 F.3d 132, 140 (5th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, there is no need to remand the case for further consideration. Allmeta's request for an extension of voluntary departure, assuming we have the authority to consider it, is denied. See Tesfamichael v. Gonzales, 411 F.3d 169, 171-72 (5th Cir. 2005).

PETITION DENIED.