

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 13 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

YUCHAO ZHANG,

Petitioner,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 16-72945

Agency No. A201-295-496

MEMORANDUM\*

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

Submitted April 11, 2018\*\*

Before: SILVERMAN, PAEZ, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Yuchao Zhang, 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. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence the agency's factual

---

\* 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).

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 dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to consider Zhang's contentions as to error in the agency's adverse credibility determination that he raises for the first time in his opening brief. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2004) (petitioner must exhaust issues or claims in administrative proceedings below).

Substantial evidence supports the agency's adverse credibility determination based on inconsistencies as to the details of Zhang's detention, the date of his arrest, when his family's land was confiscated, where Zhang lived and worked following his detention, and when Zhang contacted the authorities to contest the confiscation of his family's land. *See Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1048 (adverse credibility finding reasonable under the totality of the circumstances). Zhang's explanations do not compel a contrary conclusion. *See Lata v. INS*, 204 F.3d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000). Thus, in the absence of credible testimony in this case, Zhang's asylum claim fails. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.**