

FILED

December 10, 2003

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-60018
Summary Calendar

KOKEBE KASSA,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondent.

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals
BIA No. A78 580 303

Before SMITH, DeMOSS, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Kokebe Kassa, a native and citizen of Ethiopia, has filed a petition for review of decision of the Board of Immigration Appeal (BIA) denying her application for asylum and for withholding of removal. She argues that because the BIA summarily affirmed the decision of the Immigration Judge (IJ), the court does not owe any special deference to the IJ's decision. We have rejected the argument that a less deferential standard of review applies to an IJ's decision which has been

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

summarily affirmed by the BIA. See Moin v. Ashcroft, 335 F.3d 415, 418 (5th Cir. 2003).

Kassa argues that the IJ erred in giving more weight to the United States State Department Country Report on conditions in Ethiopia than to reports of Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and Reuters News Service which she submitted. Sources such as the United States State Department are the "most appropriate and perhaps the best resource . . . to obtain information on political situations in foreign nations." Rojas v. INS, 937 F.2d 186, 190 n.1 (5th Cir. 1991). We will not reverse the BIA's finding merely because we disagree with the BIA's evaluation of the facts or weighing of the evidence. See Jukic v. INS, 40 F.3d 747, 749 (5th Cir. 1994).

Kassa argues that the IJ's decision that she did not establish a well-founded fear of future persecution is not supported by substantial evidence. Kassa has not established that the evidence of her fear of future persecution was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder would conclude against such a finding. See Chun v. INS, 40 F.3d 76, 78 (5th Cir. 1994).

AFFIRMED.