UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1925

BELTHA MBONG MBOH,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., Attorney General,

Respondent.

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

Submitted: April 2, 2010 Decided: May 10, 2010

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and WILKINSON and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Irena I. Karpinski, LAW OFFICES OF IRENA I. KARPINSKI, Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Tony West, Assistant Attorney General, Daniel E. Goldman, Senior Litigation Counsel, Andrew B. Insenga, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PER CURIAM:

Beltha Mbong Mboh petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") dismissing her appeal from the immigration judge's order denying her motion for a continuance and reaffirming the denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal and withholding under the Convention Against Torture. We deny the petition for review.

Under 8 C.F.R. § 1003.29 (2009), the immigration judge may grant a continuance for good cause shown. See Jean v. Gonzales, 435 F.3d 475, 483 (4th Cir. 2006). The immigration judge's refusal to grant a continuance is thus subject to review for abuse of discretion. Onyeme v. INS, 146 F.3d 227, 231 (4th Cir. 1998). The denial of a continuance will be upheld "'unless it was made without a rational explanation, it inexplicably departed from established policies, or it rested on an impermissible basis, e.g., invidious discrimination against a particular race or group.'" Lendo v. Gonzales, 493 F.3d 439, 441 (4th Cir. 2007) (quoting Onyeme, 146 F.3d at 231).

We find no abuse of discretion. Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED