

DEC 10 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

No. 11-73757

Agency No. A076-858-121

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.

Joginder Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying 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, *Sangha v. INS*, 103 F.3d 1482, 1487 (9th Cir. 1997), and we deny the petition for review.

Singh testified that, during both of his arrests, police questioned him about two recent crimes and Singh's involvement in them. Substantial evidence supports the agency's finding that, even if credible, Singh failed to establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution on account of a protected ground. *See Dinu v. Ashcroft*, 372 F.3d 1041, 1044-45 (9th Cir. 2004) (record supported the agency's finding that police were pursuing legitimate goal of finding evidence of crime). Accordingly, Singh's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See id.* at 1045.

Substantial evidence also supports the agency's denial of CAT relief because Singh failed to establish it is more likely than not that he will be tortured if returned to India. *See Singh v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 1100, 1113 (9th Cir. 2006).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.