

NOV 26 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>LIGUO ZHANG,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 12-71689

Agency No. A089-776-528

MEMORANDUM*

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

Submitted November 18, 2014**

Before: LEAVY, FISHER, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Liguo Zhang, 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 (“IJ”) decision denying his application for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have

* 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).

jurisdiction 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, 1039-40 (9th Cir. 2010). We deny the petition for review.

Zhang's only challenge to the agency's adverse credibility determination is his contention that the agency did not adequately consider his explanations for three inconsistencies. We reject Zhang's contention, where the BIA considered Zhang's argument that the IJ failed to adequately address his explanations, rejected Zhang's argument, and upheld the IJ's adverse credibility determination under the totality of the circumstances. Further, the agency was not compelled to accept Zhang's explanations for these inconsistencies. *See Zamanov v. Holder*, 649 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2011). In the absence of credible testimony, Zhang's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Finally, Zhang does not raise any arguments regarding the denial of CAT relief. *See Martinez-Serrano v. INS*, 94 F.3d 1256, 1259-60 (9th Cir. 1996) (issues not specifically raised and argued in a party's opening brief are waived).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.