

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

OCT 3 2017

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

CHONGSHENG ZHONG,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-70126

Agency No. A200-261-971

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted September 26, 2017\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, TALLMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Chongsheng Zhong, 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

---

\* 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).

(“CAT”). We have 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.

Substantial evidence supports the agency’s adverse credibility determination based on Zhong’s demeanor, *see Huang v. Holder*, 744 F.3d 1149, 1155 (9th Cir. 2014) (giving special deference to findings based on demeanor), and based on inconsistencies in his testimony as to the number of house churches he attended in China, and when the police last searched for him, *see Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances). Zhong’s explanations for the inconsistencies do not compel a contrary result. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). Thus, in this case, Zhong’s asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Huang*, 744 F.3d at 1156.

Finally, Zhong’s CAT claim fails because it is based on the same testimony the agency found not credible, and Zhong does not point to any other evidence in the record that compels the conclusion that it is more likely than not he would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official in China. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**