

NOV 23 2015

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JINGRU LIU,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-71627

Agency No. A099-887-401

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted November 18, 2015\*\*

Before: TASHIMA, OWENS, and FRIEDLAND, Circuit Judges.

Jingru Liu, a native and citizen of China, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying his application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the

---

\* 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).

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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on inconsistencies between Liu's testimony and the record regarding the dates of his employment and the omission of a six month hospitalization from his declaration. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility determination was reasonable under the "totality of circumstances"); *see also Zamanov v. Holder*, 649 F.3d 969, 973-74 (9th Cir. 2011) (upholding adverse credibility finding based on inconsistencies and omission). The agency reasonably rejected Liu's explanations. *See Rivera v. Mukasey*, 508 F.3d 1271, 1275 (9th Cir. 2007); *see also Don v. Gonzales*, 476 F.3d 738, 744 (9th Cir. 2007) (IJ "did not abuse his discretion by failing to interpret the evidence in the manner advocated by [the petitioner]"). In the absence of credible testimony, we deny the petition as to Liu's asylum and withholding of removal claims. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**