

MAR 05 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 07-73073

Agency No. A096-487-620

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 16, 2010\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, GOULD, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Ranjit Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an Immigration Judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum, 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 concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Where, as here, the BIA reviews de novo the IJ’s decision, our review is limited to the decision of the BIA. *Garcia-Quintero v. Gonzales*, 455 F.3d 1006, 1011 (9th Cir. 2006). We review for substantial evidence, *Gu v. Gonzales*, 454 F.3d 1014, 1018 (9th Cir. 2006), and we deny the petition.

The BIA denied Singh’s petition for asylum and withholding of removal, finding that, even assuming Singh had proven past persecution on account of a protected ground, the Government had successfully rebutted the presumption of a well-founded fear of future persecution by demonstrating changed country conditions. Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s finding. *See Gonzalez-Hernandez v. Ashcroft*, 336 F.3d 995, 1000 (9th Cir. 2003).

Substantial evidence also supports the BIA’s denial of Singh’s CAT claim because he failed to establish it was more likely than not that he would be tortured if he returned to India. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(3)(ii); *Singh v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 1100, 1113 (9th Cir. 2006).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**