

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

DEC 20 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BINGJUN ZHANG; YINGLIN LIU,

No. 19-70724

Petitioners,

Agency Nos. A205-547-830

v.

A205-547-831

MERRICK B. GARLAND, Attorney
General,

MEMORANDUM*

Respondent.

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

Submitted December 14, 2021**

Before: WALLACE, CLIFTON, and HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Bingjun Zhang and Yinglin Liu, natives and citizens of China, petition pro
se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dismissing their appeal
from an immigration judge's decision denying their application for asylum,
withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture ("CAT").

* 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).

We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review factual findings for substantial evidence, applying the standards governing adverse credibility determinations under 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 adverse credibility determination based on Zhang's inconsistent testimony regarding her abortion certificate, hospital booklets, and rental house contract. *See id.* at 1048 (adverse credibility determination reasonable under "the totality of circumstances"). Zhang'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 determination that petitioners did not present corroborative evidence that would rehabilitate Zhang's credibility or otherwise establish her eligibility for relief. *See Garcia v. Holder*, 749 F.3d 785, 791 (9th Cir. 2014) (petitioner's documentary evidence was insufficient to rehabilitate credibility or independently support claim). Thus, in the absence of credible testimony, petitioners' asylum and withholding of removal claims fail. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2003).

In light of this disposition, we do not reach petitioners' contentions as to the merits of their asylum or withholding of removal claims. *See Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 538 (9th Cir. 2004) (courts are not required to decide issues unnecessary to the results they reach).

Substantial evidence also supports the BIA's denial of Zhang's CAT claim because it was based on the same evidence found not credible, and the record does not otherwise compel the conclusion that it is more likely than not she would be tortured by or with the consent or acquiescence of the government if returned to China. *See Shrestha*, 590 F.3d at 1048-49.

We do not consider the materials petitioners reference in their 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).

The temporary stay of removal remains in place until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.