

JUL 23 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>MIGUEL ANGEL CHICAS-GUZMAN,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 09-71409

Agency No. A099-577-165

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted July 17, 2012**

Before: SCHROEDER, THOMAS, and SILVERMAN, Circuit Judges.

Miguel Angel Chicas-Guzman, a native and citizen of El Salvador, 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”).

* 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).

We have jurisdiction under 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. *Shrestha v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 1034, 1039 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

Chicas-Guzman does not challenge the agency's dispositive finding that his application for asylum was untimely. Accordingly, his asylum claim fails.

The BIA found Chicas-Guzman not credible in part because he provided an equivocal narrative of events during his testimony. Substantial evidence supports this finding. *See id.* at 1046. In the absence of credible testimony, Chicas-Guzman's withholding of removal claim fails. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Finally, because Chicas-Guzman's CAT claim is based on the same testimony the agency found not credible, and he points to no other evidence showing it is more likely than not he will be tortured if returned to El Salvador, his CAT claim also fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.