

JUL 19 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>WENPING ZHU,</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. 07-73631

Agency No. A095-445-303

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted June 29, 2010**

Before: ALARCÓN, LEAVY, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Wenping Zhu, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for

* 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).

substantial evidence factual findings. *Tekle v. Mukasey*, 533 F.3d 1044, 1051 (9th Cir. 2008). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA's adverse credibility determination because the inconsistencies regarding the timing and length of Zhu's detention go to the heart of his claim. *See Kaur v. Gonzales*, 418 F.3d 1061, 1067 (9th Cir. 2005) (concluding the discrepancies were significant because they involved one of the few interactions between the petitioner and the police). In the absence of credible evidence, Zhu has failed to show eligibility for asylum or withholding. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Zhu does not challenge the BIA's denial of his CAT claim. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not specifically argued are deemed waived).

We lack jurisdiction to consider Zhu's claim that the IJ demonstrated bias because this issue was not exhausted before the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.