

JAN 11 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JORGE LUIS ESPILCO-RAMIREZ,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

No. 06-71352

Agency No. A076-858-438

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.

Jorge Luis Espilco-Ramirez, a native and citizen of Peru, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his applications for asylum and withholding

---

\* 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).

of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence findings of fact, *Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 2001), and de novo claims of constitutional violations, *Colmenar v. INS*, 210 F.3d 967, 971 (9th Cir. 2000). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on Espilco-Ramirez's inconsistent testimony with respect to the number of threatening notes he received from the Shining Path and when he began receiving these notes. *See Chebchoub*, 257 F.3d at 1043 (9th Cir. 2001). In the absence of credible testimony, Elpilco-Ramieriz failed to demonstrate eligibility for asylum and withholding of removal. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

We reject Espilco-Ramirez's contention that he was deprived of a full and fair hearing. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 2000) (requiring error and prejudice to prevail on a due process claim).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**