

NOV 22 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JASBIR SINGH MANN,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 07-72883

Agency No. A097-602-026

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted November 16, 2010\*\*

Before: TASHIMA, BERZON, and CLIFTON, Circuit Judges.

Jasbir Singh Mann, native and citizen of India, petitions pro se for review of a Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). Our

---

\* 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 is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence factual findings. *INS v. Elias-Zacarias*, 502 U.S. 478, 481 & n.1 (1992). We deny the petition for review.

Even if Mann's asylum application was timely filed, his asylum and withholding of removal claims fail because substantial evidence supports the BIA's conclusion that Mann can reasonably relocate to Bombay. *See Melkonian v. Ashcroft*, 320 F.3d 1061, 1069 (9th Cir. 2003).

Similarly, substantial evidence supports the BIA's conclusion that Mann failed to establish his eligibility for CAT relief because he can safely relocate. *See Singh v. Ashcroft*, 351 F.3d 435, 443 (9th Cir. 2003).

The government's motion to strike the evidence submitted by Mann that is not already contained in the administrative record is granted. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 963 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**