

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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>SURINDER SINGH,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

No. 06-74816

Agency No. A097-607-024

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.

Surinder 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 and withholding of

---

\* 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).

removal. 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 the significant contradiction within the letter of party membership supports the IJ's conclusion that several of Singh's documents may have been fraudulent, and the genuineness of these documents goes to the heart of Singh's claim. *See Desta v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 741, 745 (9th Cir. 2004). Further, the IJ reasonably rejected Singh's explanations for material omissions in his asylum application. *See Li v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 959, 962-63 (9th Cir. 2004). 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.**