



---

2003 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

10-10-2003

# Paputchi v. Atty Gen USA

Precedential or Non-Precedential: Non-Precedential

Docket No. 02-3617

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2003](http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2003)

---

## Recommended Citation

"Paputchi v. Atty Gen USA" (2003). *2003 Decisions*. 209.  
[http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2003/209](http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2003/209)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2003 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu](mailto:Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu).

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

-----  
02-3617  
-----

RUKIE PAPUTCHI,

Petitioner

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,

Respondent  
-----

ON PETITION FOR REVIEW OF AN ORDER OF THE  
BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS  
-----

BIA No. A70 903 825

Submitted Under Third Circuit Rule 34.1(a)  
September 15, 2003

Before: ALITO, AMBRO, and CHERTOFF, Circuit Judges

(Filed: October 10, 2003)

-----  
OPINION  
-----

PER CURIAM:

This is a petition for review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals holding that the petitioner had not established that she was eligible for asylum or withholding of deportation. The petitioner, a native and citizen of Bulgaria, claims that she was persecuted and fears persecution in Bulgaria because she is a Muslim of Turkish descent. Rejecting the petitioner's arguments, the BIA concluded that the petitioner had not established past persecution because her "unfortunate and discriminatory experiences over a decade ago" did not amount to "persecution" in the sense relevant here. In addition, in light of the evidence before the BIA of current country conditions in Bulgaria, the Board held that the petitioner had not met her burden of establishing a well-founded fear of persecution.

We have considered all of the arguments advanced by the petitioner in her petition for review, but we find no basis for granting the petition. We agree with the Board that the past treatment alleged by the petitioner, although deplorable, does not rise to the high level required to constitute "persecution." See *Fatin v. INS*, 12 F.3d 1233,(3d Cir. 1993). On the issue of whether the petitioner established a well-founded fear of future persecution if returned to Bulgaria, the Board implicitly found that conditions in that country are now such that the petitioner has no reasonable ground for fearing that she will be subjected to persecution based on her religion or ethnic background if she is returned. Our review of this factual finding regarding current conditions in Bulgaria is limited. See

8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(B)(2002); Abdille v. Ashcroft, 242 F.3d 477, 483 (3d Cir. 2001).

Since the Board's finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record, we must sustain it.

We have considered all of the petitioner's arguments, but find no basis for granting her petition. Therefore, the petition is denied, and the decision of the Board is affirmed.