

SEP 30 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 07-72867

Agency No. A097-390-773

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 13, 2010\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, CALLAHAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Varinder Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction

---

\* 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).

under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Tekle v. Mukasey*, 533 F.3d 1044, 1051 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility determination because Singh's testimony was internally inconsistent and inconsistent with his statements during his credible fear interview regarding the number of times he encountered militants and whether militants ever physically harmed him. *See Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1043 (9th Cir. 2001). In addition, the IJ's credibility determination is supported because Singh failed to mention during his credible fear interview that militants shot and killed his father. *See Li v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 959, 962-63 (9th Cir. 2004). Singh's explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). In the absence of credible evidence, Singh has failed to show eligibility for asylum or withholding of removal. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Singh's CAT claim is based on testimony the IJ found not credible, and Singh points to no evidence in the record that compels a finding that it is more likely than not he would be tortured if returned to India, his CAT claim also fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**