

JAN 19 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MEI CHANG OU,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 07-75015

Agency No. A098-385-950

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted January 10, 2011**

Before: BEEZER, TALLMAN, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

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

* 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).

8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings, applying the new standards governing adverse credibility determinations created by the REAL ID Act. *See Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

The agency found Ou not credible for several reasons, including Ou’s demeanor, as well as inconsistencies between Ou’s testimony at her merits hearing and asylum interview. In light of these findings, substantial evidence supports the agency’s adverse credibility determination. *See id.* at 1040-44 (adverse credibility determination was reasonable under the Real ID Act’s “totality of the circumstances”). Additionally, we reject Ou’s contention that the inconsistencies were the result of an unqualified hearing translator because Ou failed to identify any instances of incorrect translation. *See Kotasz v. INS*, 31 F.3d 847, 850 n. 2 (9th Cir. 1994). In the absence of credible testimony, Ou’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.