

JUL 20 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WIRA GUNAWAN,

Petitioner,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 08-71345

Agency No. A095-630-165

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.

Wira Gunawan, a native and citizen of Indonesia, 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.

The record does not compel the conclusion that Gunawan established changed circumstances to excuse his untimely asylum application. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1208.4(a)(4); *Ramadan v. Gonzales*, 479 F.3d 646, 657-58 (9th Cir. 2007).

Accordingly, his asylum claim fails.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s adverse credibility finding because Gunawan’s testimony was inconsistent with his asylum application as to when he learned he was allegedly on a governmental “black list,” *see Li*, 378 F.3d at 964 (“[s]o long as one of the identified grounds is supported by substantial evidence and goes to the heart of [the] claim of persecution, we are bound to accept the IJ’s adverse credibility finding”) (internal quotation omitted), and the agency reasonably rejected his explanation for the inconsistency, *see Rivera v. Mukasey*, 508 F.3d 1271, 1275 (9th Cir. 2007). In the absence of credible testimony, Gunawan’s withholding of removal claim fails. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Gunawan’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.