

NOV 30 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OVSANNA KARAPETYAN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-70748

Agency No. A079-331-036

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.

Ovsanna Karapetyan, a native and citizen of Armenia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's ("IJ") decision denying her application for asylum,

---

\* 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).

withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence adverse credibility determinations, *Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 2001), and we deny the petition for review.

Karapetyan’s testimony omitted the knife attack she suffered in March 1998, which she described in her asylum application, and her testimony was inconsistent with her declaration concerning the year of the attack following her radio broadcast. Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s adverse credibility determination because these discrepancies go to the heart of her claim. *See Li v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 959, 962-63 (9th Cir. 2004); *see also Chebchoub*, 257 F.3d at 1043 (9th Cir. 2001).

Because Karapetyan failed to demonstrate eligibility for asylum, it follows that she did not satisfy the more stringent standard for withholding of removal. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Karapetyan’s CAT claim is based on the same testimony the IJ determined was not credible, and Karapetyan points to no other evidence the IJ should have considered, she failed to establish eligibility for CAT relief. *See id.* at 1156-57.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**