

MAY 21 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>LI YU,</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. 12-72671

Agency No. A099-448-710

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted May 13, 2014\*\*

Before: CLIFTON, BEA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

Li Yu, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction

---

\* 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).

under 8 U.S.C. § 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 finding, based on lack of specificity and unresponsiveness in Yu's testimony regarding his religious activities in China. *See id.* at 1043-44; *Ren v. Holder*, 648 F.3d 1079, 1093-94 (9th Cir. 2011). The agency was not compelled to accept Yu's explanation for his failure to provide details. *See Zamanov v. Holder*, 649 F.3d 969, 974 (9th Cir. 2011). In the absence of credible testimony, Yu's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Because Yu's CAT claim is based on the same testimony the BIA found not credible, and the record does not otherwise compel the conclusion that it is more likely than not that he will be tortured if returned to China, his CAT claim also fails. *See id.* at 1156-57.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**