

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 24 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

YUNMING SONG,

Petitioner,

v.

LORETTA E. LYNCH, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 13-74493

Agency No. A099-726-579

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted January 18, 2017\*\*

Before: TROTT, TASHIMA, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Yunming Song, 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 and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

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), and we deny the petition for review.

We do not consider the materials Song references in his opening brief that are not part of the administrative record. *See Fisher v. INS*, 79 F.3d 955, 963-64 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

Substantial evidence supports the agency's determinations that Song was not credible based on inconsistencies in his testimony and between his testimony and documentary evidence as to where and when he lived at various addresses in China. *See Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances). Song's explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). We reject, as unsupported by the record, his contention that the BIA denied his claim for lack of corroboration, and thus deny his contention that the BIA violated his due process rights, *see id.* at 1246 (explaining that a petitioner must show error to prevail on a due process claim). Thus, in the absence of credible testimony, in this

case, Song's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**