

DEC 29 2009

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>HUA ZHANG,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 06-75373

Agency No. A093-052-352

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted December 15, 2009\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and FISHER, Circuit Judges.

Hua Zhang, a native and citizen of China, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her 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 concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Pal v. INS*, 204 F.3d 935, 937 n.2 (9th Cir. 2000), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s adverse credibility determination based on discrepancies between Zhang’s testimony and documentary evidence regarding when she was ordered to report for a pregnancy test, and Zhang’s failure to provide a persuasive explanation for the discrepancy. *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, Zhang’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Zhang’s CAT claim is based on the same testimony the agency found to be not credible, and Zhang points to no other evidence the agency should have considered, her CAT claim fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**