

DEC 5 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>WEI HUA RONG,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
--

No. 12-71642

Agency No. A088-492-959

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 19, 2013**

Before: CANBY, TROTT, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Wei Hua Rong, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) denial of his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction under

* 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).

8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence 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), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on the IJ's negative assessment of Rong's demeanor. *See Singh-Kaur v. INS*, 183 F.3d 1147, 1151 (9th Cir. 1999) ("special deference" given to credibility determinations based on demeanor). Substantial evidence also supports the adverse credibility determination based on Rong's inconsistent testimony regarding the name of the church he attends in the United States, and the agency's rejection of his unpersuasive explanation for the inconsistency. *See Cortez-Pineda v. Holder*, 610 F.3d 1118, 1124 (9th Cir. 2010). Accordingly, in the absence of credible testimony, Rong's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

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

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.