

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-2337**

---

RACHEL AWULI AJEBON,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General,

Respondent.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A76-470-279)

---

Submitted: August 5, 2003

Decided: September 10, 2003

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Danielle L. C. Beach-Oswald, NOTO & OSWALD, P.C., Washington, D.C., for Petitioner. Robert D. McCallum, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Mark C. Walters, Assistant Director, Jacqueline R. Dryden, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Rachel Awuli Ajebon, a native and citizen of Nigeria, petitions this court for review of a final order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") affirming, without opinion, the immigration judge's denial of asylum and withholding of removal. Ajebon challenges the BIA's conclusion that her asylum application failed to demonstrate either past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution driven by the imputed political opinions of her husband.

We find no basis to overturn the BIA's decision, however. The evidence in the record indicates that the examples of past discrimination on which Ajebon relied were not driven by imputed political opinion. See M.A. v. INS, 899 F.2d 304, 307 (4th Cir. 1990) (en banc). Likewise, the record indicates that changed circumstances undermine Ajebon's assertion that her fear of persecution should she return to Nigeria is well-founded. See Chen v. INS, 195 F.3d 198, 201-02 (4th Cir. 1999); Gebremichael v. INS, 10 F.3d 28, 37 (1st Cir. 1993).

Accordingly, we deny Ajebon's 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