

AUG 19 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>TERESA MARTINEZ-LEDESMA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 12-70033

Agency No. A098-571-031

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted August 14, 2013**

Before: SCHROEDER, GRABER, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

Teresa Martinez-Ledesma, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying her applications for cancellation of removal under 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b)(1) and (2). We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C.

* 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).

§ 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency’s factual findings, applying the 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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s adverse credibility determination based on the numerous inconsistencies between Martinez-Ledesma’s testimony, her witness’s testimony, and the record evidence, including discrepancies regarding her initial entry and the time periods in which she was abused. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(c)(4)(B)-(C); *see also Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1046-47 (“Although inconsistencies no longer need to go to the heart of the petitioner’s claim, when an inconsistency is at the heart of the claim it doubtless is of great weight.”). Martinez-Ledesma’s explanations for the inconsistencies do not compel a contrary result. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000).

In light of this disposition, we need not reach Martinez-Ledesma’s remaining contentions.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.