

SEP 07 2004

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MONA MICHEL TABEL; HODA MICHEL
TABEL,

Petitioners,

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 03-70848

Agency Nos. A29-814-745

A29-814-748

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted August 25, 2004**
San Francisco, California

Before: SCHROEDER, Chief Judge, GOODWIN, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Mona Michel Tabet and her sister Hoda Michel Tabet, natives and citizens
of Lebanon, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' summary

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or
by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral
argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

affirmance without opinion pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 3.1(e)(4) of an immigration judge's removal order and denial of their applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. Petitioners contend that they were persecuted in Lebanon because they are Christians.

The petitioners offered no evidence that they themselves were subjected to past persecution. Even assuming that they have a subjective fear of future persecution on their return to Lebanon, the record reflects no objective basis for a well-founded fear that they themselves will face future persecution in Lebanon. See Nagoulko v. INS, 333 F.3d 1012, 1018 (9th Cir. 2003).

In failing to qualify for asylum, the Tabets necessarily failed to satisfy the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. See Gonzalez-Hernandez v. Ashcroft, 336 F.3d 995, 1001 n.5 (9th Cir. 2003). Because the Tabets presented no evidence that it is more likely than not that they would be tortured upon return to Lebanon, the IJ properly rejected their claim under the Convention Against Torture. See Kamalthas v. INS, 251 F.3d 1279, 1284 (9th Cir. 2001).

The petition for review is DENIED.