

JUL 14 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

| |
|--|
| <p>JEEVAN KUMAR,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p> |
|--|

No. 08-74135

Agency No. A097-102-281

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 12, 2011**

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

Jeevan Kumar, 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, *Li v. Ashcroft*, 378 F.3d 959, 962 (9th Cir. 2004), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s adverse credibility finding where Kumar provided inconsistent testimony regarding whether he had contact with police during the 12-month period between June 1999 and June 2000. *See Singh v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 1100, 1108 (9th Cir. 2006). Additionally, the adverse credibility finding is supported by the IJ’s negative assessment of Kumar’s demeanor due to non-responsive answers and long pauses in his testimony. *See Singh-Kaur v. INS*, 183 F.3d 1147, 1151 (9th Cir. 1999) (“special deference” given to credibility determinations that are based on demeanor). In the absence of credible testimony, Kumar’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Kumar’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.