

NOV 01 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

SURINDER KUMAR ARORA,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-71958

Agency No. A096-155-787

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 19, 2010**

Before: O’SCANNLAIN, LEAVY, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

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

* 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).

jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, *Husyev v. Mukasey*, 528 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 2008), and we deny the petition.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility determination because the IJ made a specific and cogent demeanor finding, *see Arulampalam v. Ashcroft*, 353 F.3d 679, 686 (9th Cir. 2003), and because Arora's testimony regarding his injuries was inconsistent with his medical documents, *see Goel v. Gonzales*, 490 F.3d 735 (9th Cir. 2007) (per curiam). In the absence of credible testimony, Arora's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Arora's CAT claim is based on the same testimony found to be not credible, and he points to no other evidence the IJ should have considered, substantial evidence also supports the denial of CAT relief. *See id.* at 1156-57.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.