

OCT 22 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>JIAN LIU,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 12-70947

Agency No. A099-036-393

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted October 15, 2013**

Before: FISHER, GOULD, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Jian Liu, a native and citizen of China, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We

* 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).

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, 1039-40 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny in part and dismiss in part the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on the significant inconsistency between Liu's testimony and written statement regarding the events leading up to the pregnancy he claims his wife was forced to abort. *See id.* at 1046-47 (under the REAL ID Act's "totality of the circumstances" standard, inconsistency supported adverse credibility determination). Liu failed to provide a satisfactory explanation for the inconsistency. *See id.* at 1044. In the absence of credible testimony, Liu's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Finally, we lack jurisdiction to consider Liu's claim for relief under the Convention Against Torture because he did not appeal the IJ's denial of relief to the BIA. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (this court lacks jurisdiction to review contentions not raised before the BIA).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED in part; DISMISSED in part.