

MAR 06 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MANJINDER SINGH,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 07-71983

Agency No. A097-105-712

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted February 21, 2012**

Before: FERNANDEZ, McKEOWN, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Manjinder Singh, 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 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, *Rivera v. Mukasey*, 508 F.3d 1271, 1274 (9th Cir. 2007), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility determination based on inconsistencies within Singh's testimony and between his testimony and a doctor's letter regarding the treatment he received after his arrest. *See id.* at 1275 (inconsistencies regarding details of abduction went to the heart of the claim). Substantial evidence also supports the IJ's adverse credibility findings related to Singh's identity, including discrepancies regarding Singh's birthdate, age, and father's name. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003) (upholding adverse credibility finding where inconsistencies went to key elements of the asylum claim, including identity). Singh's explanations for the inconsistencies and discrepancies do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). Further, substantial evidence supports the IJ's adverse credibility determination based on the IJ's negative assessment of Singh's demeanor. *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, Singh's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah*, 348 F.3d at 1156.

Because Singh's CAT claim is based on the same testimony found to be not credible, and he does not point to any evidence that shows it is more likely than not that he will be tortured if returned to India, his CAT claim also fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.