

MAR 13 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 08-73699

Agency No. A098-448-358

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted March 12, 2012\*\*

Before: B. FLETCHER, REINHARDT, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

Hongliang Hou, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s 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, *Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 2001), and we grant the petition for review and remand.

Substantial evidence does not support the agency's adverse credibility determination, because Hou was never given an opportunity to explain the omission from his asylum application of the specific harms he suffered during his detention. *See Soto-Olarte v. Holder*, 555 F.3d 1089, 1091-92 (9th Cir. 2009) (petitioner must be given an opportunity to explain perceived inconsistencies).

Accordingly, we grant the petition as to Hou's asylum, withholding of removal, and CAT claims, and remand to the BIA on an open record for further proceedings consistent with this disposition. *See INS v. Ventura*, 537 U.S. 12, 16-18 (2002) (per curiam); *Soto-Olarte*, 555 F.3d at 1095-96.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW GRANTED; REMANDED.**