

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 93-5423  
Summary Calendar

---

ABDOLFAZL GHASSEMIAN-ESTAHBANATI,

Petitioner,

VERSUS

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Respondent.

---

Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Immigration and Naturalization Service  
(A28-553-564)

---

(June 17, 1994)

Before DAVIS, JONES and DUHÉ, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:<sup>1</sup>

Petitioner, Abdolfazl Ghassemian-Estahbanati, appeals the Board of Immigration Appeals' denial of asylum. We affirm.

I.

The petitioner argues that the Board erred in concluding that he did not have a well-founded fear of political persecution if he were deported to Iran. Our review of the record persuades us that

---

<sup>1</sup> Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

the Board's conclusion that petitioner had no objective basis for such fear is supported by substantial evidence.

Petitioner's fear of persecution in Iran stems from his employment with a private construction firm in Iran that cooperated with SAVAK, the Shah's secret security police force. Petitioner testified that he was expected to observe his co-workers and report to SAVAK any possible communists. In his capacity as a security worker in the private construction firm, petitioner reported his suspicions to SAVAK.

Petitioner left Iran in 1979 and went to England where he remained for seven years. Although petitioner testified that he was in hiding before he left Iran, he was issued a passport in Iran and used that passport to leave the country.

While petitioner was in England, he belonged to a student organization that demonstrated to show their support for the Shah. He testified that he left England after terrorists (Hezbollahs) threatened to kill him if he attended the demonstrations.

The following evidence supports the Board's conclusion that petitioner had no objective basis for fearing political persecution in Iran as a result of his security work for a construction firm:

1. No evidence was adduced of specific threats to petitioner in Iran or of any arrests or detentions in Iran.

2. The only evidence of threats to petitioner relate to the threats he received in Great Britain, which is not the country to which petitioner will be deported. There is no evidence connecting

the threats petitioner received in Great Britain to the Iranian government.

3. The Board was entitled to find that the Iranian government was not searching for petitioner when he left Iran in 1979; he apparently left without incident on a passport issued to him four months before he left the country.

4. Petitioner produced no corroborating evidence of government retribution against persons with as tenuous a relationship with SAVAK as his.

We conclude therefore that the Board's conclusions are supported by substantial evidence.

We have considered petitioner's remaining arguments and find they have no merit.

AFFIRMED.