

NOV 30 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>GURDEV SINGH,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 05-72210

Agency No. A075-309-626

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 17, 2009**

Before: ALARCÓN, TROTT, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Gurdev Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

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

protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Husyev v. Mukasey*, 528 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s adverse credibility determination because Singh’s testimony was inconsistent with his documentary evidence both concerning his claimed injuries, and as to whether his business was sold or closed, and he did not persuasively explain these inconsistencies. *See Goel v. Gonzales*, 490 F.3d 735, 739 (9th Cir. 2007) (inconsistencies between testimony and documentary evidence support an adverse credibility finding where inconsistencies go to the heart of the claim). In the absence of credible testimony, Singh’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Singh’s CAT claim is based on the testimony the IJ found not credible, and Singh points to no other evidence to show it is more likely than not he would be tortured if returned to India, his CAT claim fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.