

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 21 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

XUE LI,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-70106

Agency No. A200-781-793

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted February 13, 2018\*\*

Before: LEAVY, FERNANDEZ, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Xue Li, a native and citizen of China, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing her appeal from an immigration judge's decision denying her application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT"). We have jurisdiction under

---

\* 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).

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 the inconsistencies within her testimony as to the conditions of her house arrest and an inconsistency between her testimony and visa application as to whether she was arrested. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances). Li's explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). Substantial evidence also supports the agency's finding that Li's corroborative evidence does not independently support her claim for relief. *See Garcia v. Holder*, 749 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2014). In the absence of credible testimony, in this case, Li's asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

Finally, Li's CAT claim also fails because it is based on the same testimony the agency found not credible, and Li does not point to any other evidence in the record that compels the conclusion that it is more likely than not she would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government of China. *Id.* at 1157.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**