

December 15, 2006

Charles R. Fulbruge III
Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-60022
Summary Calendar

ABDUL AZIZ MAQSOOD,

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 999 874

Before KING, HIGGINBOTHAM, and GARZA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Abdul Aziz Maqsood, a native and citizen of Pakistan, petitions this court to review the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) affirming without opinion the immigration judge's (IJ) denial of his application for asylum and withholding of removal. Maqsood argues that the BIA erroneously determined that he failed to show past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution.

Maqsood's claims of past persecution are based on his assertion that when he was 14-years old members of the MQM party

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 R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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

fired at a car in which he was riding with his mother because his father was a member of a rival political party. He also claims that the MQM made threatening telephone calls to his house. Maqsood admitted at the hearing before the IJ that he had no proof that the MQM was involved in the attack on his car.

Maqsood's also fears future persecution if returned to Pakistan. Maqsood admitted, however, that he and his family remained in Pakistan without suffering any harm for one-and-a-half years after the attack on his car. And, he admitted that his father returned to Pakistan to attend a wedding and complete a business deal without incident.

We conclude from a review of the record that the BIA's decision is supported by substantial evidence, and the record does not compel a conclusion contrary to the IJ's findings that Maqsood failed to show past persecution on account of a protected ground or a well-founded fear of future persecution.¹

The petition for review is DENIED.

¹See Eduard v. Ashcroft, 379 F.3d 182, 187 (5th Cir. 2004); Mikhael v. INS, 115 F.3d 299, 304 (5th Cir. 1997).